

SEPTUAGINT COMMENTARY SERIES

Amos

A Commentary based on Amos in
Codex Vaticanus

W. Edward Glenny

BRILL

Amos

Septuagint Commentary Series

Editors

Stanley E. Porter

Richard S. Hess

John Jarick

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/sept

Amos

A Commentary based on Amos in Codex Vaticanus

By

W. Edward Glenny



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2013

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Glenny, W. Edward.

Amos : a commentary based on Amos in Codex Vaticanus / by W. Edward Glenny.
pages. cm. – (Septuagint commentary series)

ISBN 978-90-04-24557-0 (hardback : alk. paper) – ISBN 978-90-04-25331-5 (e-book)

I. Bible. Amos–Commentaries. I. Bible. Amos. Greek. 2013. II. Bible. Amos. English. 2013. III. Title.
IV. Series: Septuagint commentary series.

BS1585.53.G54 2013

224'.8077–dc23

2013012678

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual “Brill” typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see www.brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 1572-3755

ISBN 978-90-04-24557-0 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-25331-5 (e-book)

Copyright 2013 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Global Oriental, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers and Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

CONTENTS

Preface	VII
Abbreviations	IX
Introduction to the Commentary on Amos	1
Text and Translation	12
Commentary	41
Bibliography	163
Index of References to Ancient Literature	169
Index of Authors	182

PREFACE

My relationship with the Greek text of Amos began in the spring of 2002. My wife and I were privileged to spend that semester at Cambridge University, working in the Tyndale House library. I was doing preliminary work on a dissertation for the Department of Classics and Near Eastern Studies at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis, and Professor Robert Gordon encouraged me to write my dissertation on the translation technique of LXX-Amos. James Palmer and Jennifer Dines also helped me in my early work, answering my questions and inspiring me with their own work in the LXX-Minor Prophets; Jennifer and I have continued our dialogue on the LXX-Minor Prophets, and her work has greatly influenced my understanding of LXX-Amos.

The next step in my study of Greek Amos was a commentary on the Hebrew and Greek texts of Amos. My dissertation adviser at the University of Minnesota, Dr. Philip Sellew, gave generously of his time to read and critique that commentary; it has never been published, but it was the foundation for my dissertation on LXX-Amos, which was finished in 2007 and also published by Brill (W. Edward Glenny, *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos*. VTSup 126. Leiden: Brill, 2009). The next stage in my study of Greek Amos is this commentary in the Septuagint Commentary Series. It differs from my previous work in LXX-Amos, because, in keeping with the description of this series, it is based on a single Greek manuscript, Vaticanus (B), and it is an attempt to study the Greek text of Amos as an artifact in its own right and primarily for its own sake, not as a witness to the developing tradition of the Hebrew book of Amos. The goal in this commentary is to try to understand what the text of Amos, as found in Vaticanus, would have meant to an early Greek reader of it, who did not know Hebrew and possibly did not even have access to the Hebrew text of the book.

Many others who are too numerous to mention have supported my work in LXX-Amos in various ways, but I especially thank Northwestern College, St. Paul, MN. It has been my great honor to occupy the J. Edwin Hartill Chair in Biblical and Theological Studies at Northwestern College for 2011–2012. This appointment has allowed me to have time to research and write, and this commentary would not have been possible without that time. I am also thankful for the good people at Brill who have helped me in the publication

of this volume, especially my editor, Stanley Porter. In addition, I want to thank my wife, Jackie, the love of my life, whose constant encouragement through the many years of my study on LXX-Amos has never wavered. Finally, I would be remiss if I did not thank “the Almighty One” whose enabling grace was experienced at every stage of this work.

Earlier in this Preface I mentioned some of the ways my *Doktorvater*, Philip Sellew, contributed to this study of LXX-Amos. I was blessed to spend many mornings in his office discussing Amos and learning from his insights into the Greek text of that book. I had another *Doktorvater*, Darrell Bock, whose main influence on my life was before I started studying LXX-Amos. He helped me become a better interpreter of Scripture and inspired me with his enthusiasm for that task. I have great respect for both of these men, and it is to them that I dedicate this book.

ABBREVIATIONS

Throughout the commentary I have used the standard abbreviations for books of the Bible, the Apocrypha, and Josephus instead of giving the full names of books. When I refer to Hosea the prophet or other prophets I spell out the name (i.e., Hosea), but when I refer to the book of Hosea or another prophetic book I use the abbreviation (Hos).

ABD	The Anchor Bible Dictionary
acc.	accusative
B	Vaticanus
BA	La Bible D' Alexandrie
BDAG	Bauer, Walter, Frederick W. Danker, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2000.
BDF	Blass, Friedrich, and Albert Debrunner. <i>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . Translated and revised by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1961.
Brenton	Brenton's translation of the LXX, found in <i>The Septuagint Version, With Apocrypha, Greek, and English</i> . London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, n.d. Repr., Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976.
CD	Damascus Document
C & S	Conybeare, F.C. and St. George Stock. <i>Grammar of Septuagint Greek</i> . Boston: Ginn and Company, 1905; Repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001.
CTAT	Barthélemy, Dominique. <i>Critique Textuelle de l' Ancien Testament. Tome 3. Ezéchiel; Daniel et les 12 Prophètes</i> . Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.
CHB	Cambridge History of the Bible
dat.	dative
Dines	Dines, Jennifer Mary. "The Septuagint of Amos: A Study in Interpretation." Ph.D. Diss., London, 1991.
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
ECB	Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible
EDB	Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible
esp.	especially
gen.	genitive
Glenny	Glenny, W. Edward. <i>Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos</i> . VTSup 126; Leiden: Brill, 2009.
H	Hebrew
HR	Hatch and Redpath
LEH	Lust, J., E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint</i> . 2 vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992 and 1996.

LSJ	Liddell, H.G., R. Scott, and H.S. Jones. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: University Press, 1996.
MHT	Moulton, James Hope. <i>A Grammar of New Testament Greek</i> . 4 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1908–1976.
MP	Minor Prophets
Mss	manuscript(s)
MT	Masoretic Text
Mur	Muraoka, T. <i>A Greek English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets</i> . Louvain: Peters, 2002.
MUR	Muraoka, T. <i>A Greek English Lexicon of the Septuagint</i> . Louvain: Peters, 2009.
NETS	New English Translation of the Septuagint
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NIDOTTE	New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis
NT	New Testament
OT	Old Testament
PG	J.-P. Migne, ed. <i>Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca</i> . 166 vols. Paris: Migne, 1857–1886.
pl.	plural
sing.	singular
Supp	The Supplement to LSJ
TDNT	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament
Th	Theodotian text of Daniel
× (as in 2 ×)	the number of times something (usually a word) recurs (2 × means 2 times)

INTRODUCTION TO THE COMMENTARY ON AMOS

This commentary is distinctive in several ways. First, it is a commentary on the Greek text of Amos, and there are not many commentaries on the Septuagint. Second, instead of being based on a modern edition of the Septuagint, it is based on a single Greek manuscript: Vaticanus (B). And third, this commentary is an attempt to study the Greek text of Amos that is found in Vaticanus as an artifact in its own right and primarily for its own sake, not as a witness to the developing tradition of the Hebrew book of Amos. The goal in this commentary is to try to understand what the text of Amos, as found in Vaticanus, would have meant to an early Greek reader of it, who did not know Hebrew and possibly did not even have access to the Hebrew text of the book.

History of Interpretation of LXX-Amos

Although there are many studies of individual passages in LXX-Amos, there are not many commentaries or studies of the complete text. It is the purpose of this section to survey five important studies related to the interpretation of the Greek text of Amos. This survey should give the reader some insight into the main issues in the interpretation of the Greek text of Amos; it should also serve as an entrée into the main themes and theology of LXX-Amos, since the last three of these works discuss such issues. Sherman E. Johnson's study of "The Septuagint Translators of Amos" is a somewhat general investigation of Amos with a special interest in the number of translators involved in the translation. He focuses on the translation of different portions of the book, and he finds different renderings of words in chapters 5–6 and "peculiarities in the translation of Hebrew moods and tenses" in those two chapters (25). He concludes that chapters 5–6 were translated by a different hand than chapters 1–4 and 7–9, or else chapters 5–6 were reworked after the entire work was translated. Johnson's short dissertation has some helpful observations concerning the translation of verb forms and tenses (8–9), various vocabulary (19–27), and selected passages in LXX-Amos (28–37).

James A. Arieti's dissertation, "A Study in the Septuagint of the Book of Amos," is a general overview of issues related to LXX-Amos. He has three main chapters on the text of Amos, differences between the MT

and the Septuagint text of Amos (using chiefly Ziegler's Greek text), and the Septuagint as a translation.

Jennifer Mary Dines' dissertation contains a wealth of information on LXX-Amos, and fortunately, even though it has not been published, it is available on line (go to <http://ethos.bl.uk> and search for "The Septuagint of Amos"). The study is broad in its scope, as the title suggests ("The Septuagint of Amos: A Study in Interpretation"). Dines' goal is "to identify the exegetical character of Septuagint Amos" by recognizing and discussing the significant differences between the MT and the LXX in Amos (2, 10). She claims that her conclusions in this regard are tentative and her goals modest; she is attempting "to begin to bring to light the exegetical resources of the text as a first step towards evaluation" (10). She feels her work has raw material that could be used in the study of the translation technique and theology of LXX-Amos (interview with Dines, April 1, 2005). She studies LXX-Amos in order, providing an annotated translation of the whole and a commentary in places, especially where the LXX differs from the MT. Her study of the exegetical character of the translation leads to the conclusion that while the translator of Amos attempted a faithful rendering of his Hebrew text, he "deals creatively with perplexing words and phrases in such a way as to reveal something of the theological, cultural, and partisan leanings of himself and his community" (2). Also, she concludes that there is "bias for Jerusalem and against Samaritans, Seleucids, their Jewish supporters, and possibly Essenes" (2). She also tentatively suggests that the most plausible setting for the translation is in Egypt in the decades following the Maccabean Revolt. Her study not only addresses the exegetical character of LXX-Amos; it also traces the influence on biblical interpretation up to the mid-fifth century of the special passages that are studied in the dissertation where the LXX differs from the MT.

Aaron W. Park's study, *The Book of Amos as Composed and Read in Antiquity*, goes beyond the study of LXX-Amos, but the forty pages he devotes to the Septuagint text of the book (138–177) are important. His goals are "to trace the composition and transmission of the Book of Amos in general and Amos 5:25–27 and 9:11–15 in particular" and to demonstrate that Amos 9:11–15 reflects a seventh century BCE redaction, which was designed to revise the exile theme of 5:25–27 by its positive portrayal of Judah (1). Park first surveys the current state of research on the Prophets, then he discusses methodology, defining his own as grounded in form criticism. Then after discussing the composition of Amos, he spends almost 100 pages (pp. 131–214) on the transmission or *Nachleben* of Amos, especially 5:25–27 and 9:11–15. The forty pages that Park spends on LXX-Amos (138–177) contain charts of the textual differences

between the editions by Ziegler, Rahlfs, and Swete, lists of many of the differences between the MT and the LXX in Amos, arranged according to different categories, and an outline and discussion of the structure of LXX-Amos. After comparing Amos in the MT and the LXX Park concludes that the translation of LXX-Amos is “a dynamic equivalent rendering of the text, and in some sense a whole new composition in itself. The presumed Hebrew *Vorlage* is modified to facilitate the reader’s understanding of the biblical text and to apply it directly to a changing historical situation” (169). He finds evidence that LXX-Amos “reflects socio-historical circumstances during the Second Temple period”; these evidences include: (1) an apologetic stance against pagan religions in 7:9; (2) an eschatological hermeneutic in 7:1; and (3) Antiochus IV Epiphanes’ persecution of the Jews in 4:2, cf. 2 Macc 7:3 (171). He believes Thackeray may be correct that Amos was translated by the end of the second century (Park, 171; Thackeray, *Grammar*, ix), and he also finds evidence that LXX-Amos presupposes the persecution of Jews for their faith and the inclusion of gentiles into the Jewish religion (9:11–12). In keeping with these tendencies, he believes the translator downplays pro-Jerusalemite ideology (1:1) and introduces the messianic figure (4:13). He proposes the translator’s purpose was to justify the inclusion of gentiles in Jewish religion, as is seen in the symbolism of Israel through Jerusalem in 1:1 and the global believing community in 9:12. He concludes that LXX-Amos continued to speak to Jews in diaspora and that since some prophetic words had already been fulfilled, the remainder of the prophecy would give hope of restoration to those who acknowledged and stood fast in the Jewish religion (171).

The goal of my previous book on LXX-Amos, *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos*, is to describe and analyze as exhaustively as possible the translation technique and exegetical practice of the translator of the Septuagint of Amos. My focus in this study is the differences between the Hebrew (MT) and Ziegler’s (Göttingen) LXX text in Amos, since the differences between the LXX and its *Vorlage* are important indicators of the translator’s translation technique and theology. The book has two main parts, addressing in order the translation technique (chapters 2–4) and the theology (chapters 5–7) of LXX-Amos. The translation technique section is not especially relevant to this commentary. But the section on the theology of the translator is a good introduction to some of the main themes in the Greek version of Amos. Therefore, I will summarize my conclusions concerning the theology of the translator, as it is reflected in his translation.

Three areas of theological bias or *Tendenz* are especially important in LXX-Amos; they are anti-Syrian and anti-Samaritan bias (chapter five),

the doctrine of God (chapter six), and finally Gentiles, eschatology, and messianism (chapter seven). Because the translator of LXX-Amos follows closely his *Vorlage*, and develops his own ideas and concerns primarily where he finds difficulties in the Hebrew text, it is natural that his theology follows fairly closely the emphases in the Hebrew text of Amos; thus the anti-Syrian and anti-Samaritan bias in LXX-Amos are a further development of main themes in all versions of Amos. Such bias is found in the LXX renderings in 1:3–5, 15; 3:12; 4:2, 3, 5; 6:1, 7; 8:14; and 9:7. There is also evidence of anti-Baal polemic in 1:4 and 4:13 and Hellenistic religious influences in 2:4, 8 and 7:9. Chapter six (“God in LXX-Amos”) contains a discussion of reverential renderings of God, the treatment and use of anthropomorphisms, and the use of *Pantokrator* in LXX-Amos. The translator is concerned about descriptions of God that might compromise God’s character (esp. 4:4, 5 and 8:7), but with the exception of 1:2, he does not seem to be bothered by anthropomorphic descriptions of God. The use of *Pantokrator* to render *Sabaoth* is consistent with the translation technique throughout the Minor Prophets and argues for one translator of LXX-Twelve; additions of *Pantokrator* (3 times) in Amos indicate that changing concepts of God among the Jews had influenced the translator, and he saw God more as a universal sovereign, which has implications for the relationship of gentiles to God. Chapter seven brings together three topics that are related in LXX-Amos; it addresses “Gentiles, Eschatology, and Messianism in LXX-Amos.” Differences between the MT and the LXX in LXX-Amos give several hints of the importance of these topics to the translator of LXX-Amos. Key eschatological passages are 4:2b; 7:1; 8:8, 14; 9:5; and 9:9–10. LXX-Amos 9:11–12 is a very important passage in the development of Christian theology (esp. Acts 15:16–17), because of its description of gentiles seeking the Lord (object implied in LXX) and being his people (having his name called upon them). LXX-Amos 4:13 and 9:11–12 also connect gentiles with Messianic ideas. The rendering of LXX-Amos suggests that there was an expectation in the community of the translator of an eschatological, messianic, saviour (4:13; 9:11), who would open the way for gentiles to seek the Lord (4:13; 9:12), and that there would also be an appearance of his eschatological enemy, Gog (7:1). (This last paragraph originally appeared as part of a longer summary of this work which can be found in the *Tyndale Bulletin* 61.1 [2010]: 53–56.)

Three other commentaries on LXX-Amos will be important for its future study: the *Septuaginta Deutsch* (LXX.E) commentary on Amos by Evangelia G. Dafni and Aaron Scharf, which was published in 2011, the volume on Amos in *La Bible D’Alexandrie* (BA) commentary series (vol. 23.2), which is being prepared by Eberhard Bons and Jennifer Mary Dines, and the volume in the

Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint (SBLCS), which is a project of the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies and has been assigned to Jan Joosten. These commentary series differ from Brill's Septuagint Commentary Series in their textual base (BA uses Rahlfs, LXX.E uses the Göttingen edition and Rahlfs for books not yet included in the Göttingen edition, and SBLCS uses the best available critical edition); they also differ from this series in their philosophy (each is concerned in slightly different ways with the relationship of the Greek to its Hebrew *Vorlage*). I did not receive the *Septuaginta Deutsch* commentary in time to use it for this work, and *La Bible D'Alexandrie* and Society of Biblical Literature series volumes on Amos were not yet published at the time this commentary was finished.

Amos in Vaticanus

Since the focus of this commentary is the Greek text of Amos as it is found in Vaticanus, we will now turn our attention to that manuscript and the text of Amos in it. Vaticanus is a "fourth-century vellum codex of the Bible" (Metzger, 74). Ziegler (*Duodecim prophetae*) was not able to identify the origin of the text form in the Minor Prophets of Vaticanus; therefore, he groups it with three other uncial manuscripts: W, a papyrus in the Freer collection from the third century CE; Sinaiticus (S), a codex from the fourth century CE; and Venetus (V), a codex from the eighth century CE.

Metzger thought the similarity of the text of Vaticanus with the Coptic versions and Greek papyri suggested the manuscript's place of origin was Egypt and Alexandria (Metzger, 74). Hort believed it originated in Rome (Metzger, 74). Skeat's detailed theory of the history of Vaticanus is plausible and very interesting, even though it cannot be proven with certainty ("The Codex Vaticanus in the Fifteenth Century" and "The Codex Sinaiticus, The Codex Vaticanus, and Constantine"). Skeat argues Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are the work of the same scriptorium in Caesarea, and he gives evidence that both codices were among fifty Bibles commissioned by Constantine in a letter to Eusebius in about 330 CE. Thus, it is possible that Vaticanus was commissioned by Constantine and delivered to him in Constantinople from Caesarea. At some point between the fourth century and the first record of its presence in Rome in 1475 the lettering in the manuscript was traced over in an attempt to make it more legible. The introduction of lectionaries and service-books in the ninth century would have rendered huge Bibles like Vaticanus obsolete, and apparently it was neglected and deteriorated until it was renovated and

missing portions (from Genesis, Psalms, and the middle of Hebrews onward) were replaced in a fifteenth-century hand. Since the first mention of it in an inventory of the Vatican Library was in 1475, it is possible it came to Rome from Constantinople in the period shortly before the Turks captured the Byzantine capital in 1453. Skeat claimed that the Greek delegation presented Vaticanus as a gift to the Reunion Council of Ferrara-Florence of 1438–1439, and that was how it came to Italy.

Auld's commentary in this series (*Joshua*, ix–xviii) has an excellent introduction to the format of the text in Vaticanus, although the methods the scribe used to divide the text are different in the Minor Prophets than they are in Joshua. The scribe used two main methods to indicate the divisions in the text of the Minor Prophets in Vaticanus. The most basic and earliest divisions were denoted clearly by the first scribe, who began each new section on a new line, which he extended slightly into the left margin. He also marked the end of a section by leaving blank any unused balance of the final line in that section. In order to begin each new section on a new line, sometimes the scribe had to abbreviate or decrease the size of script at the end of the last line in the previous section so he could fit everything in. Thirty-four different paragraphs are so marked in Amos. These thirty-four paragraphs vary greatly in length; the shortest sections are less than one verse (7:8a) and one verse (3:12; 4:9, 10, and 11), and the longest section extends twenty-one verses (5:21–6:14). These thirty-four paragraphs are the basic divisions of the text of this commentary, and I tried to summarize the contents of each with a title or heading. Auld (xii) suggests that these most basic divisions of the text “direct our attention to what the scribe or his tradition found important in the text.” This is true at times in Amos, as in the oracles to the nations in chapters 1–2, but the point of other divisions is hard to understand. It is obvious that many of the original paragraph divisions were not determined solely by the development and thought of the text; for example, the paragraph 7:4–7 in B contains all of the vision of judgment fire (in 7:4–6) and also includes the first part of the next vision, the vision of the plumb line (a vision of “adamant” or “hard metal” in the LXX). In B there is a paragraph break in the midst of the vision of the plumb line (or “hard metal”) in 7:7–9. Furthermore, in B 7:8–9 is divided in the middle of 7:8. One wonders if at times the scribe was weary and took regular breaks or was interrupted often, as indicated by many short divisions that are found in sequence in certain sections. (Note the 5 divisions in 4:7–13 and in 7:1–11.)

A second and later method of indicating divisions in the Minor Prophets of Vaticanus is the use of numeral capital letters at the beginning of sections of the book. There are six such numeral capital letters in Amos (*alpha* [1]

through *digamma* [6]). The numerical capital *alpha* was originally written at the beginning of the text where the first letter of the first verse now appears (see below). In ten of the books of the Twelve the initial numerical letter (*alpha*) has been rewritten in black ink above the first column of the book at the left side of the column; Hos and Obad do not have an initial numerical letter above the first line. Thus, six sections are distinguished by numeral capital letters in Amos in B, and all five of these section dividers correspond with one of the original thirty-four paragraph divisions discussed above. Skeat observes that the reason these divisions were inserted is “wholly obscure.” He goes on to suggest, “Possibly they were originally intended to act as a primitive form of collation, i.e. a check that the text was complete and continuous, but if so the intention was very soon forgotten” (“The Codex Vaticanus in the Fifteenth Century,” 457). These sections vary greatly in length, and some of the numerical capital letters are not placed at major breaks in the development of the book.

The list below shows the six sections marked by numeral capital letter divisions and the earlier thirty-four divisions, which are listed after the capital letter divisions where they further divide the six capital letter sections.

- A. 1:1–2:3—1:1–5, 1:6–8, 1:9–10, 1:11–12, 1:13–15, 2:1–3
- B. 2:4–16—2:4–5, 2:6–16
- Γ. 3:1–5:15—3:1–8, 3:9–11, 3:12, 3:13–4:6, 4:7–8, 4:9, 4:10, 4:11, 4:12–13, 5:1–15
- Δ. 5:16–7:9—5:16–17, 5:18–20, 5:21–6:14, 7:1–3, 7:4–7, 7:8a, 7:8b–9
- E. 7:10–9:10—7:10–11, 7:12–17, 8:1–3, 8:4–10, 8:11–14, 9:1–6, 9:7–10
- F. 9:11–15—9:11–12, 9:13–15

In Vaticanus each of the books of the Twelve begins with the first letter of the text capitalized in the left margin at the top of the first column of the book. These were added to the text, and the original numeral capital letter, marking the first section (A) was erased when they were added (see above). It is interesting that in Psalms, Amos, Tobit, and Matthew the scribe forgot to erase the original first letter of the book when he added the capitalized letter in the margin. Thus, at the beginning of Amos in B there is a capital *lambda* that was added in the margin and the original one in the text at the beginning of the book (see Skeat, “The Codex Vaticanus in the Fifteenth Century,” 458). There are three columns of Greek text on each page. The last column of a book is left blank after the end of the book to the bottom of the column, except for a subscript containing the name of the book and a numerical capital letter, giving the place of the book (i.e., one through twelve) in the order of the Twelve in Vaticanus. The next book begins at the top of the next column.

Text and Textual Notes

The text of the Twelve in Vaticanus (Codex 1209 in the Vatican Library) was analyzed in a digital copy to which I was given access at the Vatican Library and in the Facsimile Edition of B (*Bibliorum Sacrorum Graecorum Codex Vaticanus B*. Roma: Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, 1999). The text in the commentary is an attempt to reconstruct the original of B. The textual notes in this commentary are meant to help the reader understand the text of Vaticanus (B) that is the basis of this commentary. They are based on my collation of the text of Vaticanus and the notes in the Greek texts of Swete, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. I began with Swete's text as my base, and then I adapted it to reflect the original readings of B, as far as I was able to do so. The text notes give the reader most of the differences between the original of B and the correctors of it, the main differences between B and other manuscripts, and the main differences between the three modern editions of the Twelve that were consulted for this work (Swete, Rahlfs, and Ziegler). These differences include differences in spelling, with the exception of differences concerning the use of the moveable *nu*. However, the text of B in the commentary is an attempt to reflect the spellings in the original of B, including *nus*.

Some of the most common differences between B and modern editions of the LXX are variations in the vowels, most of which are due to altered pronunciation. In his introductory comments on the orthography and phonetics of the LXX Thackeray explains that at the time when the oldest uncials, including B, were written (4th–6th century AD) “there was no fixed orthography in existence.” He continues by explaining specifically that “the diphthongs had ceased to be pronounced as such, and scribes now wrote indifferently $\alpha\iota$ or ϵ , $\epsilon\iota$ or ι , $\omicron\iota$ or υ , having nothing to guide them in their choice but any acquaintance which they happened to possess with classical models” (71). Since I have tried to note wherever B differs from modern editions, many such variants occur in my textual notes on B. Especially common in B is the scribe's preference to write long ι as $\epsilon\iota$ (Thackeray, 85–86) and the exchange of $\alpha\iota$ and ϵ (Thackeray, 77–78; see also the discussion in Auld, xvi–xvii).

The symbols used in this commentary for the manuscripts and text notes are fairly standard; they are as follows:

- A Codex Alexandrinus
- B Codex Vaticanus
- L Lucian's text. This is taken from Rahlfs's LXX.
- Q Codex Marchalianus
- S Codex Sinaiticus
- V Codex Venetus

W	Washington (mss V in the Freer collection)
Mss	manuscript or manuscripts
*	the original reading of a mss
(?)	the reading is questionable
^c	the reading of a corrector of a mss
^{ab}	the readings of the first and second correctors of a mss
†	only the mss which are cited and, at the most, not more than one minuscule, which is not mentioned, support the reading. This is a common classification in Rahlfs text that has been adopted here, following him.
=	corresponding to. This symbol is used, for example, when a reading corresponds to the reading in the Masoretic Text (= MT).
modern editions	Swete, Rahlfs, and Ziegler

Chapter and Verse Divisions and Capitalization

The chapter and verse divisions follow Swete and NETS. Where these two might differ in verse or chapter divisions I try to mention this in the commentary. In the English translation of B I capitalize the first words of sentences, the first words of direct speech, and proper nouns. In Greek I have followed the pattern I found in modern editions of the Greek text of capitalizing the first words of paragraphs, the first words of direct speech, and proper nouns. Of course, there are many differences of opinion on the identification of proper nouns and also on what should be classified as direct speech. For example, NETS does not consider the Lord's messages in the oracles to the nations in Amos 1–2 to be direct speech, but Swete does. *Nomina sacra* in B are represented in the Greek text on pages 12–39 by all capitals; I have not employed a macron to indicate when a word is abbreviated, as Vaticanus does. Also, I have not used *nomina sacra* in the text notes or in the Greek citations in the commentary.

Punctuation, Spelling, and Italics

Punctuation generally follows Swete for Greek and NETS for English. I have not tried to mark paragraph divisions in the Greek text and English translation, but the paragraph divisions in Vaticanus are marked in the commentary. Spelling of names and place names in the English translation follows NETS as far as possible.

I have tried to translate literally. Occasionally where it was felt necessary items are added in the English translation that are not explicit in the Greek

in order to communicate the sense of the Greek in English. Where this is done the added items are italicized.

Citations in the Commentary

Normally the last name of the author and page number(s) are used to designate the source of material cited or referred to in the commentary. Where an author has more than one work in the bibliography the last name and an abbreviated form of the title of the work cited are given. There are three exceptions to this. The English translation of the Septuagint by Lancelot C.L. Brenton, which was first published in 1851, is referred to by the translator's last name, even though his name does not appear in some editions of his translation. Also, since the works by Dines and Glennly listed below in this section are cited often in the commentary, only the author's last name is used to refer to them when referring to these works, even though each author has another item in the bibliography.

Brenton: *The Septuagint Version, With Apocrypha, Greek, and English*. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, n.d. Repr., Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976.

Dines: Dines, Jennifer Mary. "The Septuagint of Amos: A Study in Interpretation." Ph.D. Diss., London, 1991.

Glenny: Glennly, W. Edward. *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos*. VTSup 126; Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Introduction to the Twelve Minor Prophets in the Septuagint

For a discussion of introductory issues related to the Twelve Minor Prophets in the Septuagint, see Glennly, *Hosea*, 1–23 ("Introduction to the Twelve Prophets in the Septuagint") and Glennly, 241–265. In those works I propose that the translation of the Twelve is the work of one translator (with the possible exception of Hab 3) about the middle of the second century BCE in Egypt.

AMOS

TEXT AND TRANSLATION

- 1:1 ΛΟΓΟΙ Ἀμώς οἱ ἐγένοντο ἐν Ἀκκαρεῖμ ἐν Θεκοῦε, οὓς εἶδεν ὑπὲρ Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐν ἡμέραις Ὁζείου βασιλέως Ἰούδα καὶ ἐν ἡμέραις Ἱεροβοάμ τοῦ Ἰωὰς βασιλέως Ἰσραήλ, πρὸ δύο ἐτῶν τοῦ σεισμοῦ.
- 1:2 Καὶ εἶπεν ΚΣ ἐκ Σιών ἐφθέγξατο, καὶ ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ ἔδωκεν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐπένθησαν αἱ νομαὶ τῶν ποιμένων, καὶ ἐξηράνθη ἡ κορυφή τοῦ Καρμήλου.
- 1:3 καὶ εἶπεν ΚΣ Ἐπὶ ταῖς τρισὶν ἀσεβείαις Δαμασκοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς τέσσαρσιν οὐκ ἀποστραφήσομαι αὐτόν, ἀνθ' ὧν ἔπριζον πρίοσιν σιδηροῖς τὰς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσας τῶν ἐν Γαλαάδ·
- 1:4 καὶ ἐξαποστελῶ πῦρ εἰς τὸν οἶκον Ἀζαήλ, καὶ καταφάγεται θεμέλια υἱοῦ Ἀδέρ·
- 1:5 καὶ συντρίψω μοχλοὺς Δαμασκοῦ, καὶ ἐξολεθρεύσω κατοικούντας ἐκ πεδίου Ὠν, καὶ κατακόψω φυλὴν ἐξ ἀνδρῶν Χαρράν, καὶ αἰχμαλωτευθήσεται λαὸς Συρίας ἐπίκλητος, λέγει ΚΣ.
- 1:6 Τάδε λέγει ΚΣ Ἐπὶ ταῖς τρισὶν ἀσεβείαις Γάζης καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς τέσσαρσιν οὐκ ἀποστραφήσομαι αὐτούς, ἔνεκεν τοῦ αἰχμαλωτεῦσαι αὐτοὺς αἰχμαλωσίαν τοῦ Σαλωμών, τοῦ συγκλείσαι εἰς τὴν Ἰδουμαίαν·
- 1:7 καὶ ἐξαποστελῶ πῦρ ἐπὶ τὰ τεῖχη Γάζης, καὶ καταφάγεται θεμέλια αὐτῆς.
- 1:8 καὶ ἐξολεθρεύσω κατοικούντας ἐξ Ἀζώτου, καὶ ἐξαρθήσεται φυλὴ ἐξ Ἀσκάλως, καὶ ἐπάξω τὴν χειρά μου ἐπὶ Ἀκκαρών, καὶ ἀπολοῦνται οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀλλοφύλων, λέγει ΚΣ.

1:1 Ἀκκαρεῖμ] B, A, Q, and Swete; καριαθιαρειμ L and C, which is clearly an attempt to identify it with the biblical place name, Kiriath-Jearim; νακκαριμ Rahlfs and Ziegler, which is influenced by the MT's כְּרִיתִי ("herdsmen") and the versions. All the renderings in the different LXX mss are apparently place names. Perhaps the translator did not recognize the Hebrew כְּרִיתִי ("among the herdsmen"), and mistaking the *daleth* for a *resh* he transliterated it as a place name, "in Naccarim." The reading "Accarim," found in all the earliest Greek manuscripts suggests that an early copyist or the translator confused the ν at the end of the preceding preposition and the one at the beginning of the transliteration of the word for "herdsmen" and left the consonant off of the beginning of the second word. ἐν Θεκοῦε] B and Swete; ἐκ Θεκοῦε Rahlfs and Ziegler. Ὁζείου] B* and Swete; Ὁζίου B^{ab}, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. 1:5 ἐχμαλωτευθήσεται] B*, apparently an alternative spelling of αἰχμαλωτευθήσεται; αἰχμαλωτισθήσεται B^{ab}, A, Q, Rahlfs, and Swete; αἰχμαλωτισθήσεται A and Q; αἰχμαλωτισθήσονται Ziegler, following the MT and perhaps thinking it is the most difficult reading. 1:7 τείχη] The *epsilon* is small, but written in the word, and thus it is apparently the reading of B*; the same in 1:10. Cf. 1:14 where all the letters are normal size. Perhaps at that point the scribe realized the correct reading and went back and corrected 1:7 and 10. This is the reading in modern editions. 1:8 ἐξολεθρεύσω] B* (?) and modern editions; ἐξολοθρεύσω B^{ab}.

Chapter One

(1) The words of Amos, which came *to him* in Accarim in Thekoue, which he saw concerning Ierousalem in the days of Ozias king of Ioudas and in the days of Ieroboam the son of Ioas king of Israel three years before the earthquake. (2) And he said: The Lord has spoken out of Sion, and out of Ierousalem he has uttered his voice; and the pastures of the shepherds mourned, and the summit of Carmel was dried up. (3) And the Lord said: On account of the three ungodly acts of Damascus and on account of the four I will not turn away from it; because with iron saws they were sawing the pregnant women of the Galaadites. (4) And I will send out fire against the house of Hazael, and it shall consume the foundations of the son of Hader. (5) And I will crush the bars *of the gates* of Damascus, and I will utterly destroy the inhabitants from the plain of On, and I will destroy the tribe of the men of Charran, and the alien people of Syria will be led into captivity, says the Lord. (6) This is what the Lord says: On account of the three ungodly acts of Gaza and on account of the four I will not turn away from them, because they led captive the captives of Salomon to confine *them* in Idumea. (7) And I will send out fire against the walls of Gaza, and it will consume the foundations of her. (8) And I will destroy completely the inhabitants from Azotus, and I will remove a tribe from Askalon, and I shall bring my hand against Akkaron, and the survivors of the foreigners will be destroyed, says the Lord.

- 1:9 Τάδε λέγει ΚΣ 'Επὶ ταῖς τρισὶν ἀσεβείαις Τύρου καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς τέσσαρσιν οὐκ ἀποστραφήσομαι αὐτήν, ἀνθ' ὧν συνέκλεισαν αἰχμαλωσίαν τοῦ Σαλωμών εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, καὶ οὐκ ἐμνήσθησαν διαθήκης ἀδελφῶν·
- 1:10 καὶ ἐξαποστελῶ πῦρ ἐπὶ τὰ τεῖχη Τύρου, καὶ καταφάγεται τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς.
- 1:11 Τάδε λέγει ΚΣ 'Επὶ ταῖς τρισὶν ἀσεβείαις τῆς Ἰδουμαίας καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς τέσσαρσιν οὐκ ἀποστραφήσομαι αὐτούς, ἕνεκα τοῦ διῶξαι αὐτούς ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλυμήνατο μητέρα ἐπὶ γῆς, καὶ ἤρπασεν εἰς μαρτύριον φρίκην αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ ὄρμημα αὐτοῦ ἐφύλαξεν εἰς νίκος·
- 1:12 καὶ ἐξαποστελῶ πῦρ εἰς Θαιμάν, καὶ καταφάγεται θεμέλια τειχέων αὐτῆς.
- 1:13 Τάδε λέγει ΚΣ 'Επὶ ταῖς τρισὶν ἀσεβείαις υἱῶν Ἀμμὼν καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς τέσσαρσιν οὐκ ἀποστραφήσομαι αὐτόν, ἀνθ' ὧν ἀνέσχιζον τὰς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσας τῶν Γαλαδιδιτῶν, ὅπως ἐνπλατύνωσιν τὰ ὅρια ἐαυτῶν·
- 1:14 καὶ ἀνάψω πῦρ ἐπὶ τὰ τεῖχη Ῥαββά, καὶ καταφάγεται θεμέλια αὐτῆς μετὰ κραυγῆς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ πολέμου, καὶ σεισθήσεται ἐν ἡμέραις συντελεῖ αὐτῆς·
- 1:15 καὶ πορεύονται οἱ βασιλεῖς αὐτῆς ἐν αἰχμαλωσίᾳ, οἱ ἱερεῖς αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, λέγει ΚΣ.
- 2:1 Τάδε λέγει ΚΣ 'Επὶ ταῖς τρισὶν ἀσεβείαις Μωάβ καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς τέσσαρσιν οὐκ ἀποστραφήσομαι αὐτόν, ἀνθ' ὧν κατέκαυσαν τὰ ὅσα βασιλέως τῆς Ἰδουμαίας εἰς κόνιν·
- 2:2 καὶ ἐξαποστελῶ πῦρ ἐπὶ Μωάβ, καὶ καταφάγεται τὰ θεμέλια τῶν πόλεων αὐτῆς, καὶ ἀποθανεῖται ἐν ἀδυναμείᾳ Μωάβ μετὰ κραυγῆς καὶ μετὰ φωνῆς σάλπιγγος·
- 2:3 καὶ ἐξολοθρεύσω κριτὴν ἐξ αὐτῆς, καὶ πάντας αὐτῆς ἀποκτενῶ μετ' αὐτοῦ, λέγει ΚΣ.

1:9 Ἰουδαίαν] B* and A^c; Ἰδουμαίαν B^{ab} and modern editions; cf. v. 11. 1:10 τεῖχη] B* and modern editions. See 1:7. τὰ θεμέλια] B, Q, W, and L; θεμέλια V and A. Cf. 1:4; 2:2. 1:11 μητέρα] B, V, and Swete; μήτρην A, Q, W, Rahlfs, and Ziegler, taking the Hebrew, מִיָּמֶה, concretely. εἰς νίκος] B*, Swete, and Ziegler; εἰς νεῖκος B^c and Rahlfs. (Swete believes that both correctors of B made the correction.) LSJ (176) gives evidence that νίκος was written νεῖκος about the first century CE. Cf. 8:7. 1:13 ἐνπλατύνωσιν] B* and Swete; ἐμπλατύνωσιν A and Rahlfs; ἐμπλατύνωσι B^b and Ziegler. ἐαυτῶν] B and Swete; αὐτῶν A, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. 1:14 ἡμέραις συντελεῖ] B* (?), perhaps the scribe understood it to be the verb form συντέλει; συντελείας B^{ab}, V, and Q, and Swete; ἡμέρᾳ συντελείας A, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. 2:1 ἀσεβείας] B*; ἀσεβείαις B^{ab} and modern editions; this must be a mistake in B*. 2:2 τὰ θεμέλια] B and Swete; θεμέλια A, Q, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. ἀδυναμείᾳ] B* and Swete; ἀδυναμία Rahlfs and Ziegler. 2:3 ἐξολοθρεύσω] B* (?) and modern versions; ἐξολοθρεύσω B^c. πάντας αὐτῆς] B and Swete; πάντας τοὺς ἄρχοντας αὐτῆς A, Q, Rahlfs, and Ziegler.

(9) This is what the Lord says: On account of the three ungodly acts of Tyre and on account of the four I will not turn away from her, because they confined Salomon's captives in Ioudea and did not remember the covenant between brothers. (10) And I will send out fire against the walls of Tyre, and it will consume the foundations of her. (11) This is what the Lord says: On account of the three ungodly acts of Idumea and on account of the four I will not turn away from them, because they pursued his brother with the sword, and he ravaged *his* mother in the land, and he seized his trembling anger for a proof, and he preserved his violent impulse forever. (12) And I will send out fire against Thaiman, and it will consume the foundations of her walls. (13) This is what the Lord says: On account of the three ungodly acts of the sons of Ammon and on account of the four I will not turn away from him, because they were ripping up the pregnant women of the Galaadites so that they might widen their own borders. (14) And I will kindle a fire upon the walls of Rabba, and it will consume her foundations with shouting in the day of war, and she will be shaken in the days it will destroy her. (15) And her kings will go forth in captivity, their priests and their rulers together, says the Lord.

Chapter Two

(1) This is what the Lord says: On account of the three ungodly acts of Moab and on account of the four I will not turn away from him, because they burned the bones of the king of Idumea to dust; (2) and I will send out fire against Moab, and it will consume the foundations of her cities, and Moab will perish in helplessness with shouting and with the sound of a trumpet. (3) And I will utterly destroy a judge out of her, and I will kill all *the people* of her together

- 2:4 Τάδε λέγει ΚΣ 'Επὶ ταῖς τρισὶν ἀσεβείαις υἱῶν 'Ιούδα καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς τέσσαρσιν οὐκ ἀποστραφήσομαι αὐτόν, ἕνεκα τοῦ ἀπώσασθαι αὐτοὺς τὸν νόμον τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ τὰ προστάγματα αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐφυλάξαντο, καὶ ἐπλάνησεν αὐτοὺς τὰ μάτια αὐτῶν ἃ ἐποίησαν, οἷς ἐξηκολούθησαν οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν ὀπίσω αὐτῶν·
- 2:5 καὶ ἐξαποστελῶ πῦρ ἐπὶ 'Ιούδαν, καὶ καταφάγεται θεμέλια 'Ιερουσαλήμ.
- 2:6 Τάδε λέγει ΚΣ 'Επὶ ταῖς τρισὶν ἀσεβείαις 'Ισραὴλ καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς τέσσαρσιν οὐκ ἀποστραφήσομαι αὐτόν, ἀνθ' ὧν ἀπέδοντο ἀργυρίου δίκαιον, καὶ πένητα ἔνεκεν ὑποδημάτων,
- 2:7 τὰ πατοῦντα ἐπὶ τὸν χοῦν τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐκονδύλιζον εἰς κεφαλὰς πτωχῶν, καὶ ὁδὸν ταπεινῶν ἐξέκλειναν, καὶ υἱὸς καὶ πατήρ αὐτοῦ εἰσεπορεύοντο πρὸς τὴν αὐτὴν παιδίσκην, ὅπως βεβηλώσιν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ΘΥ αὐτῶν·
- 2:8 καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν δεσμεύοντες σχοινοῖς παραπετάσματα ἐποιοῦν ἐχόμενα τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, καὶ οἶνον ἐκ συκοφαντιῶν ἔπεινον ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ ΘΥ αὐτῶν.
- 2:9 ἐγὼ δὲ ἐξήρα τὸν Ἀμορραῖον ἐκ προσώπου αὐτῶν, οὗ ἦν καθὼς ὕψος κέδρου τὸ ὕψος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἰσχυρὸς ἦν ὡς δρυς, καὶ ἐξήρανα τὸν καρπὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπάνωθεν καὶ τὰς ρίζας αὐτοῦ ὑποκάτωθεν·
- 2:10 καὶ ἐγὼ ἀνήγαγον ὑμᾶς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου, καὶ περιήγαγον ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ μ' ἔτη τοῦ κατακληρονομήσαι τὴν γῆν τῶν Ἀμορραίων·
- 2:11 καὶ ἔλαβον ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν ὑμῶν εἰς προφήτας, καὶ ἐκ τῶν νεανίσκων ὑμῶν εἰς ἀγιασμόν· μὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ταῦτα, υἱοὶ 'Ισραὴλ; λέγει ΚΣ.
- 2:12 καὶ ἐποτίζετε τοὺς ἡγιασμένους οἶνον, καὶ τοῖς προφήταις ἐνετέλλεσθε λέγοντες Οὐ μὴ προφητεύσητε.
- 2:13 διὰ τοῦτο ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ κυλεῖω ὑποκάτω ὑμῶν ὃν τρόπον κυλεῖται ἡ ἄμαξα ἡ γέμουσα καλάμης·
- 2:14 καὶ ἀπολεῖται φυγὴ ἐκ δρομέως, καὶ ὁ κραταῖος οὐ μὴ κρατήσῃ τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ μαχητὴς οὐ μὴ σώσει τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ,
- 2:15 καὶ ὁ τοξότης οὐ μὴ ὑποστῇ, καὶ ὁ δόξυς τοῖς ποσὶν αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ διασωθῇ, οὐδὲ ὁ ἱππεὺς οὐ μὴ σώσει τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ,

2:7 ἐξέκλειναν] B*; ἐξέκλιναν B^{ab} and modern editions. βεβηλώσιν] B, V, and Swete; βεβηλώσωσι(ν) Q, A, Ziegler and Rahlfs. The reading in B is apparently an alternative spelling of the verb (perhaps a mistake, i.e., homoioteleuton), rather than the acc., sing., fem. form of the noun βεβήλωσις. 2:8 ἔπεινον] B*; ἔπινον B^{ab} and modern editions. 2:9 ἐξήρανα] (from ξηραίνω) B, A, Q, W, and Swete; ἐξήρα (from ἐξαίρω) L, Rahlfs and Ziegler; this reading is the same as the earlier verb in the verse, which translates the same Hebrew verb. 2:10 μ' ἔτη] B and Swete have the abbreviation for "forty years"; Cf. τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη A, Q, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. 2:13 κυλεῖω] B*; κυλίω B^{ab} and modern editions. κυλεῖται] B*; κυλίεται B^{ab} and modern editions. 2:14, 15 (2×) σώσει] B, V, and Swete (also Q in v. 14 and W in v. 15); σώση Rahlfs and Ziegler.

with him, says the Lord. (4) This is what the Lord says: On account of the three ungodly acts of the children of Ioudas and on account of the four I will not turn away from him, because they rejected the Law of the Lord, and his commands they did not keep; and their vain things, which they made, led them astray, which things their fathers followed after. (5) And I will send out fire against Ioudas, and it will consume the foundations of Ierousalem. (6) This is what the Lord says: On account of the three ungodly acts of Israel and on account of the four I will not turn away from him, because they sold a righteous man for money and a poor man for sandals, (7) which tread upon the dust of the earth; and they were striking at the heads of the needy; and they perverted the way of the lowly; and a son and his father were going in to the same slave girl so that they profane the name of their god; (8) and binding together their garments with cords, they were making curtains near the altar; and they were drinking wine *gained* from extortion in the house of their god. (9) But I destroyed the Amorrite from before them, whose height was as the height of a cedar, and he was strong as an oak, and I dried up his fruit from above and his roots from below. (10) And I brought you up out of the land of Egypt, and I led you around in the wilderness forty years to inherit the land of the Amorrites. (11) And I chose from among your sons for prophets and from among your young men for consecration; are not these things so, sons of Israel, says the Lord? (12) And you were giving the consecrated ones wine to drink, and you were giving orders to the prophets, saying, "Do not ever prophesy!" (13) Therefore, behold, I am rolling under you in the manner that the wagon that is full of straw is rolled along. (14) And flight will perish from the runner, and the strong man will not retain possession of his strength at all, and there is no way the warrior will save his life. (15) And the archer will not be able to stand at all, and the one who is swift on his feet will in no way be delivered, and the horseman will never save his life.

- 2:16 και ὁ κραταιὸς οὐ μὴ εὐρήσει τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ ἐν δυναστείαις, ὁ γυμνὸς διώξεται ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, λέγει ΚΣ.
- 3:1 Ἀκούσατε τὸν λόγον τοῦτον ὃν ἐλάλησεν ΚΣ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ κατὰ πάσης φυλῆς ἧς ἀνήγαγον ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου, λέγων
- 3:2 Πλὴν ὑμᾶς ἔγνω ἐκ πασῶν φυλῶν γῆς· διὰ τοῦτο ἐκδικήσω ἐφ' ὑμᾶς πάσας τὰς ἁμαρτίας ὑμῶν.
- 3:3 εἰ πορεύσονται δύο ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ καθόλου ἐὰν μὴ γνωρίσωσιν ἑαυτούς;
- 3:4 εἰ ἐρεύξεται λέων ἐκ τοῦ δρυμοῦ αὐτοῦ θήραν οὐκ ἔχων; εἰ δώσει σκύμνος φωνὴν αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς μάνδρας αὐτοῦ καθόλου ἐὰν μὴ ἀρπάσῃ τι;
- 3:5 εἰ πεσεῖτε ὄρεον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἄνευ ἱκευτοῦ; εἰ σχασθήσεται παγὶς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἄνευ τοῦ συλλαβεῖν τι;
- 3:6 εἰ φωνήσῃ σάλπιγξ ἐν πόλει καὶ λαὸς οὐ μὴ πτοηθήσεται; εἰ ἔσται κακία ἐν πόλει ἢν ΚΣ οὐκ ἐποίησεν;
- 3:7 διότι οὐ μὴ ποιήσῃ ΚΣ ὁ θς πρᾶγμα ἐὰν μὴ ἀποκαλύψῃ παιδείαν πρὸς τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ τοὺς προφῆτας.
- 3:8 λέων ἐρεύξεται, καὶ τίς οὐ φοβηθήσεται; ΚΣ ὁ θς ἐλάλησεν, καὶ τίς οὐ προφητεύσει;
- 3:9 Ἀπαγγείλατε χάριαι ἐν Ἀσσυρίοις καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς χώρας τῆς Αἰγύπτου, καὶ εἶπατε Συνάχθητε ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος Σαμαρείας, καὶ ἴδετε θαυμαστά πολλὰ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς καὶ καταδυναστείαν τὴν ἐν αὐτῇ·
- 3:10 καὶ οὐκ ἔγνω ἃ ἔσται ἐναντίον αὐτῆς, λέγει ΚΣ, οἱ θησαυρίζοντες ἀδικίαν καὶ ταλαιπωρίαν ἐν ταῖς χώραις αὐτῶν.
- 3:11 διὰ τοῦτο τάδε λέγει ΚΣ ὁ θς Τύρος κυκλόθεν ἡ γῆ σου ἐρημωθήσεται, καὶ κατὰξί ἐκ σοῦ ἰσχύς σου, καὶ διαρπαγῇσονται αἱ χώραί σου.
- 3:12 τάδε λέγει ΚΣ Ὁν τρόπον ὅταν ἐκπάσῃ ὁ ποιμὴν ἐκ στόματος τοῦ λέοντος δύο σκέλη ὁ λοβὸν ὠτίου, οὕτως ἐκσπασθήσονται οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ κατέναντι τῆς φυλῆς καὶ ἐν Δαμασκόφ.

2:16 καὶ ὁ κραταιὸς οὐ μὴ εὐρήσει] B* and Swete (L has the verb form εὕρη.); καὶ ὁ κραταιὸς εὐρήσει B^{ab}; καὶ εὐρήσει A, Q, W, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. 3:2 γῆς] B (†) and Swete; τῆς γῆς Rahlfs and Ziegler. 3:5 πεσεῖτε] B*; πεσεῖται B^{ab} and modern editions. This appears to be a mistake in B caused by hearing; but see Thackeray, § 6. 3:6 οὐ μὴ] B (only uncial with this reading) and Swete; οὐ Rahlfs and Ziegler. 3:7 ποιήσῃ] B, V, Q, and Swete; ποιήσῃ Rahlfs and Ziegler. παιδείαν] B, W, Swete, and Ziegler; παιδείαν αὐτοῦ A, Q, and Rahlfs (the MT has a pronominal suffix). 3:9 καταδυναστείαν τὴν] B, V, and Swete; τὴν καταδυναστείαν τὴν A, Q, W, and Rahlfs; καταδυναστείαν Ziegler. 3:11 κυκλόθεν] B, Swete, and Rahlfs; καὶ κυκλόθεν V and Ziegler. 3:12 ἐκπάσῃ] B*; ἐκπάσῃ B^{ab} and modern editions. See the plural form later in the verse: ἐκσπασθήσονται; the comparison with the verb ἐκσπάω later in the verse suggests the early reader of B would have understood the verb to be ἐκσπάω, and I have translated it this way. (I cannot find evidence for a verb ἐκπάω.) ὁ] B* (?); ἡ B^{ab} and modern versions. The apparent reading in B is very difficult and is confirmed in Ziegler's apparatus. The sense of the corrected reading was apparently understood in B*. ἐκσπασθήσονται] B; ἐκσπασθήσονται modern editions. τῆς φυλῆς] B, V, and Swete; φυλῆς A, Q, Rahlfs and Ziegler.

(16) And the strong man will never find his confidence in a powerful army; the naked man will flee on that day, says the Lord.

Chapter Three

(1) Hear this word which the Lord has spoken concerning you, O house of Israel, and against every tribe which I brought up out of the land of Egypt, saying: (2) Only you have I known out of all the tribes of the earth; for this reason I will bring punishment upon you for all your sins. (3) Will two ever start out on a journey together if they do not know each other? (4) Will a lion roar out of his thicket without having prey? Will a lion cub ever make a noise from his den unless he has taken something? (5) Will a bird fall on the ground without a fowler? Will a trap on the ground spring up without catching something? (6) Will a trumpet sound in a city and the people not be terrified? Will there be distressing circumstances in a city which the Lord has not made? (7) Therefore, the Lord God will never do anything unless he reveals instruction to his servants, the prophets. (8) A lion will roar, and who will not be afraid? The Lord God has spoken, and who will not prophesy? (9) Proclaim to the districts among the Assyrians and to the districts of Egypt and say, "Assemble yourselves on the mountain of Samaria and see many marvelous things in the midst of her and the oppression that is in her." (10) And she did not know what things will be in her presence, says the Lord, those who are storing up unrighteousness and misery in their districts. (11) Therefore, thus says the Lord God: Tyre, all around your land shall be made desolate, and he will bring down from you your strength and your districts will be spoiled. (12) Thus says the Lord: Just as when the shepherd pulls out of the mouth of the lion two legs, the lobe of an ear, so will the sons of Israel be pulled out who dwell in Samaria before the tribe and in Damascus.

- 3:13 ἱερεῖς ἀκούσατε καὶ ἐπιμαρτύρασθαι τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰακώβ, λέγει ΚΣ ὁ θς ὁ παντοκράτωρ,
 3:14 διότι ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὅταν ἐκδικῶ ἀσεβείας τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ ἐκδικήσω ἐπὶ τὰ θυσιαστήρια Βαιθὴλ, καὶ κατασκαφήσεται τὰ κέρατα τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ πεσοῦνται ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν·
 3:15 συνεχῶ καὶ πατάξω τὸν οἶκον τὸν περίπτερον ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τὸν θερινόν, καὶ ἀπολοῦνται οἱ οἰκοὶ ἐλεφάντινοι, καὶ προστεθήσονται ἕτεροι οἱκοὶ πολλοί, λέγει.
 4:1 Ἀκούσατε τὸν λόγον τοῦτον, δαμάλεις τῆς Βασανίτιδος αἱ ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῆς Σαμαρείας, αἱ καταδυναστεύουσαι πτωχοὺς καὶ καταπατοῦσαι πένητας, αἱ λέγουσαι τοῖς κυρίοις αὐτῶν Ἐπίδοτε ἡμῖν ὅπως πίωμεν.
 4:2 ὁμνύει ΚΣ κατὰ τῶν ἀγίων αὐτοῦ διότι Ἰδοὺ ἡμέραι ἔρχονται ἐφ' ὑμᾶς καὶ λήμψονται ὑμᾶς ἐν ὅπλοις, καὶ τοὺς μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰς λέβητας ὑποκειομένους ἐμβαλοῦσιν ἔμπυροι λοιμοί,
 4:3 καὶ ἐξενεχθήσεσθε γυμναὶ κατέναντι ἀλλήλων, καὶ ἀποριφήσεσθε εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ Ῥομμάν, λέγει ΚΣ.
 4:4 Εἰσήλθατε εἰς Βαιθὴλ καὶ ἡσεβήσατε, καὶ εἰς Γάλλαλα ἐπληθύνετε τοῦ ἀσεβῆσαι, καὶ ἠνέγκατε εἰς τὸ πρωὶ θυσίας ὑμῶν, εἰς τὴν τριημερίαν τὰ ἐπιδέκατα ὑμῶν·
 4:5 καὶ ἀνέγνωσαν ἔξω νόμον, καὶ ἐπεκαλέσαντο ὁμολογίας· ἀναγγεῖλατε ὅτι ταῦτα ἡγάπησαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ, λέγει ΚΣ ὁ θς.
 4:6 καὶ ἐγὼ δώσω ὑμῖν γομφιασμόν ὁδόντων ἐν πάσαις ταῖς πόλεσιν ὑμῶν, καὶ ἔνδειαν ἄρτων ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς τόποις ὑμῶν, καὶ οὐκ ἐπεστρέψατε πρὸς μέ, λέγει ΚΣ.

3:13 [ἱερεῖς] In B the noun “priests” is the opening word of 3:13, as is the case without exception in the treatment of the Patristic commentators, according to Dines, 111. In most mss (and in Swete, Rahlfs, and Ziegler) it is the last word in 3:12, the location in the MT of וְהַיְיָ , to which it corresponds. ἐπιμαρτύρασθαι] B; ἐπιμαρτύρασθε modern editions; see Thackeray, § 6. 3:15 συνεχῶ καὶ πατάξω τὸν οἶκον] B, A, W, Rahlfs, and Swete have both verbs (B* and Swete have συνεχῶ for the first verb; B^{ab}, Rahlfs, and Ziegler have συνεχῶ), but Ziegler does not include καὶ πατάξω; the MT has only one verb also. Ziegler’s decision not to include καὶ πατάξω is puzzling because that is the Greek verb used to render the corresponding Hebrew verb in its other three occurrences in Amos (4:9; 6:11; and 9:1). ἕτεροι οἱκοί] B and Swete; these words are transposed in most other mss, including A, Q, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. λέγει] B (†); λέγει Κύριος modern editions. 4:2 ὑποκειομένους] B*; ὑποκαίσιον B^{ab} and modern editions. 4:3 ἀποριφήσεσθε] B, followed by Swete has only one ρ. Swete notes there is a correction by B^{ab} to ρρ, the reading found in Rahlfs and Ziegler. κύριος] B, Swete, and Ziegler; κύριος ὁ θεός W, A, and Rahlfs. Ῥομμάν] B and Swete. Ρεμμάν A, Q, Rahlfs and Ziegler; Ραμμάν W. 4:4 ἡσεβήσατε] B and Swete; ἡνομήσατε A, Q, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. 4:5 ἀναγγεῖλατε] B, V, Q^c, and Swete; ἀπαγγεῖλατε W, Rahlfs, and Ziegler.

(13) Hear, O Priests, and bear witness to the house of Iakob, says the Lord, the God who is Almighty. (14) For on the day when I will punish the ungodly acts of Israel upon him, also I will bring punishment upon the altars of Baithel, and the horns of the altar will be torn down, and they will fall upon the ground. (15) I will demolish and I will smite the colonnaded house upon the summer house, and ivory houses will perish and many other houses also, he says.

Chapter Four

(1) Hear this word, heifers of Basanitis, who *are* in the mountain of Samaria, who oppress the poor and trample under foot the needy, who say to their lords, "Give us, so that we may drink." (2) The Lord swears by his holy ones: For this reason, behold, days are coming upon you, and they will take you with weapons, and fiery destroyers will throw those with you into boiling caldrons, (3) and you will be carried out naked before one another, and you will be cast away onto the mount Romman, says the Lord. (4) You entered Baithel and you broke the Law, and in Galgala you multiplied the doing of ungodly deeds, and you brought your sacrifices in the early morning, for three days your tithes. (5) They read a law outside, and they called for votive offerings. Proclaim, "The sons of Israel loved these things," says the Lord, the God. (6) And I myself will give you toothache in all your cities and want of bread in all your places. Yet you have not returned to me, says the Lord.

- 4:7 καὶ ἐγὼ ἀνέσχον ἐξ ὑμῶν τὸν ὑετὸν πρὸ τριῶν μηνῶν τοῦ τρυγητοῦ, καὶ βρέξω ἐπὶ πόλιν μίαν, ἐπὶ δὲ πόλιν μίαν οὐ βρέξω· μερὶς μία βραχὴσεται, καὶ μερὶς ἐφ' ἣν οὐ βρέξω ξηρανθήσεται.
- 4:8 καὶ συναθροισθήσονται δύο καὶ τρεῖς πόλεις εἰς πόλιν μίαν τοῦ πιεῖν ὕδωρ καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐμπλησθῶσιν, καὶ οὐκ ἐπεστράφητε πρὸς μέ, λέγει ΚΣ.
- 4:9 ἐπάταξα ὑμᾶς ἐν πυρώσει καὶ ἐν ἰκτέρῳ· ἐπληθύνετε κήπους ὑμῶν, ἀμπελῶνας ὑμῶν καὶ συκῶνας ὑμῶν καὶ ἐλαιῶνας ὑμῶν κατέφαγεν ἡ κάμπη, καὶ οὐδ' ὥς ἐπεστρέψατε πρὸς μέ, λέγει ΚΣ.
- 4:10 ἐξαπέστειλα εἰς ὑμᾶς θάνατον ἐν ὁδῷ Αἰγύπτου, καὶ ἀπέκτεινα ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ τοὺς νεανίσκους ὑμῶν μετὰ αἰχμαλωσίας ἱππῶν σου, καὶ ἀνήγαγον ἐν πυρὶ τὰς παρεμβολὰς ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ ὑμῶν, καὶ οὐδ' ὥς ἐπεστρέψατε πρὸς μέ, λέγει ΚΣ.
- 4:11 κατέστρεψα ὑμᾶς καθὼς κατέστρεψεν ὁ θς Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα, καὶ ἐγένεσθε ὡς δαλὸς ἐξεσπασμένος ἐκ πυρός, καὶ οὐδ' ὥς ἐπεστρέψατε πρὸς μέ, λέγει ΚΣ.
- 4:12 διὰ τοῦτο οὕτως ποιήσω σοι, Ἰσραὴλ· πλὴν ὅτι οὕτως ποιήσω σοι, ἐτοιμάζου τοῦ ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸν θν σου, Ἰσραὴλ.
- 4:13 διότι στερεῶν βροντὴν καὶ κτίζων ΠΙΝΑ καὶ ἀπαγγέλλων εἰς ἀνθρώπους τὸν ΧΝ αὐτοῦ, ὁ ποιῶν ὄρθρον καὶ ὁμίχλην, ἐπιβαίνων ἐπὶ τὰ ὕψη τῆς γῆς· ΚΣ ὁ θς ὁ παντοκράτωρ ὄνομα αὐτῷ.
- 5:1 Ἀκούσατε τὸν λόγον ΚΥ τοῦτον ὃν ἐγὼ λαμβάνω ἐφ' ὑμᾶς θρήνον Οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ
- 5:2 ἔπασεν, οὐκέτι μὴ προσθήσει τοῦ ἀναστήναι· παρθένος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἔσφαλεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ, οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἀναστήσων αὐτήν.

4:7 βρέξω] B, W, L, Swete, and Ziegler; βρέξω ἐπ' αὐτήν A, Q, and Rahlfs. 4:8 πόλεις 1^o] B*; πόλεις B^{ab} and modern editions. ἐπεστράφητε] B, L, and Swete; ἐπεστρέψατε Ziegler and Rahlfs (also in 4:6, 9, 10, and 11). 4:10 ὀργῇ ὑμῶν] B, W, Swete, and Ziegler; ὀργῇ μου A, Q, L, and Rahlfs. 4:13 διότι] B* and Swete; διότι ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ B^{ab} (ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ is written in the margin), A, Q, Rahlfs, and Ziegler; διότι ἰδοὺ V. ὁ] B and Swete include an article before ποιῶν; Rahlfs and Ziegler do not include the article. 5:2 προσθήσει] B, C, and Swete; προσθῇ A, Q, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. The latter reading (second aorist subjunctive) is consistent with the negative particle μὴ; cf. 7:8, 13; 8:2. γῆς αὐτοῦ] B and Swete; γῆς αὐτῆς Q, Rahlfs, and Ziegler; γῆς A.

(7) Also I myself withheld the rain from you three months before the harvest; and I will send rain upon one city, and upon another city I will not send rain; one part will be rained upon and the part upon which I do not send rain, it will be dried up. (8) And two or three cities will be gathered together into one city to drink water, and they will not be satisfied. Yet you have not returned to me, says the Lord. (9) I smote you with fever and jaundice. You multiplied your gardens; the caterpillar devoured your vineyards and your fig yards and your olive groves. Yet, even so, you have not returned to me, says the Lord. (10) I sent death to you in the way to Egypt, and I slew with the sword your young men along with captive bands of your horses, and I sent your encampments up in fire in *my* anger against you; yet, even so, you have not returned to me, says the Lord. (11) I overthrew you just as God overthrew Sodoma and Gomorra, and you were like a brand snatched out of the fire; yet, even so, you have not returned to me, says the Lord. (12) Therefore, I will do such a thing to you, Israel; however, because I will do such a thing to you, prepare to call upon your God, Israel. (13) For he who strengthens thunder and creates wind and proclaims to people his anointed, he who makes daybreak and misty dark and treads on the high places of the earth: the Lord, the God, the Almighty One, is his name.

Chapter Five

(1) Hear this word of the Lord, which I am taking up for you as a funeral dirge. The house of Israel (2) has fallen, never again to arise. The virgin of Israel has fallen upon its land; there is no one who will raise her up.

- 5:3 διὰ τοῦτο τάδε λέγει ΚΣ ΚΣ Ἡ πόλις ἐξεπορεύοντο χεῖλιλοι, ὑπολιφθήσονται ρ', καὶ ἐξ ἧς ἐξεπορεύοντο ρ', ὑπολειφθήσονται δέκα τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραήλ.
- 5:4 διότι τάδε λέγει ΚΣ πρὸς τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραήλ Ἐκζητήσατέ με, καὶ ζήσεσθε·
- 5:5 καὶ μὴ ἐκζητεῖτε Βαιθὴλ καὶ εἰς Γάλγαλα μὴ εἰσπορεύεσθε, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ φρέαρ τοῦ ὅρκου μὴ διαβαίνετε, ὅτι Γάλγαλα αἰχμαλωτευσμένη αἰχμαλωτευθήσεται, καὶ Βαιθὴλ ἔσται ὡς οὐχ ὑπάρχουσα.
- 5:6 ἐκζητήσατε τὸν ΚΝ, καὶ ζήτε, ὅπως μὴ ἀναλήμψῃ ὡς πύρ ὁ οἶκος Ἰωσήφ καὶ καταφάγῃ αὐτόν, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ σβέσων τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραήλ.
- 5:7 ὁ ποιῶν εἰς ὕψος κρίμα, καὶ δικαιοσύνην εἰς γῆν ἔθηκεν·
- 5:8 ὁ ποιῶν πάντα καὶ μετασκευάζων, καὶ ἐκτρέπων εἰς τὸ πρῶν σκιάν, καὶ ἡμέραν εἰς νύκτα συσκοτάζων· ὁ προσκαλούμενος τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ ἐκχέων αὐτὸ ἐπὶ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς, ΚΣ ὄνομα αὐτῶ·
- 5:9 ὁ διαιρῶν συντριμμὸν ἐπ' ἰσχύν, καὶ ταλαιπωρίαν ἐπὶ ὀχύρωμα ἐπάγων.
- 5:10 ἐμείψαν ἐν πύλαις ἐλέγχοντα, καὶ λόγον ὅσιον ἐβδελύξαντο.
- 5:11 διὰ τοῦτο ἀνθ' ὧν κατεκονδύλιζον πτωχοὺς, καὶ δῶρα ἐκλεκτὰ ἐδέξασθε παρ' αὐτῶν, οἴκους ξεστοὺς ᾠκοδομήσατε καὶ οὐ μὴ κατοικήσητε ἐν αὐτοῖς, ἀμπελώννας ἐπιθυμητοὺς ἐφυτεύσατε καὶ οὐ μὴ πῖνῃτε τὸν οἶνον ἐξ αὐτῶν.

5:3 διὰ τοῦτο] B (†) and Swete; διότι Rahlfs, Ziegler. κύριος κύριος] B, Rahlfs, and Swete (who has κύριος Κύριος); κύριος Ziegler. There is no support for a capital *kappa* in B, as Swete has; the letters are all uncials in B, and the word κύριος is *nomina sacra* both times it occurs (κς), as it is normally written in B. ἐξεπορεύοντο 1⁰] B* (?); ἐξ ἧς ἐξεπορεύοντο B^c (ἐξ ἧς in margin) and modern editions. The original text of B does not contain this prepositional phrase the first time it occurs in the verse in modern editions; however it is written in the margin and connected with the text by an obelus in both locations. One obelus and the correction are written across from the second occurrence of the phrase (2 lines below another obelus in the text that indicates where the prepositional phrase should be added to the text) and the scribe's notation in the margin has an extension seeming to point to the second occurrence and thus indicating that the first occurrence is parallel to it. Ziegler suggests the absence of these words in the original of B is a case of homoioarchton. ὑπολιφθήσονται (2×)] B*; ὑπολειφθήσονται B^{ab} and modern editions. ρ'] Twice in this verse B and Swete use the abbreviation for ἑκατόν (see Smyth, § 347). See also 5:26. 5:4 Ἰσραήλ] B*; Ἰσραήλ B^{ab} and modern editions. 5:6 ζήτε] B* and Swete; ζήσατε B^{ab}, Rahlfs, and Ziegler; ζήσετε A; ζήσεσθε L (the future verb forms were perhaps influenced by 5:4). καταφάγῃ] B, L, and Swete; καταφάγεται A, Q, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. 5:7 ὁ ποιῶν] B, V, and Swete. κύριος ὁ ποιῶν Q, L, Ziegler, and Rahlfs; κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ ποιῶν A. 5:8 ὁ ποιῶν] B, L, Q^a, and Swete (cf. 5:7). ποιῶν W, A, Q*, Rahlfs, and Ziegler (cf. MT). σκιάν] B, A, Q, and Swete; σκιῶν θανάτου W, L, Q^{ms}, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. The latter reading apparently comes from the translator reading תְּהוֹמָה ("darkness") as two words: צֶלַע ("shadow") and מוֹת ("death"). κύριος] B and Swete (cf. MT); κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ A, Q, W, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. See also 4:13; 5:14, 15, and 27. Swete capitalizes κύριος here in his text (see the textual note on 5:3). 5:10 ἐμείψαν] B*; ἐμίψαν B^{ab} and modern editions. 5:11 κατεκονδύλιζον] B, A, Q, W, and Swete; κατεκονδύλιζετε L, Rahlfs, and Ziegler (= MT). The ending of the verb is not complete in B, but ends with a suspension, a horizontal line, which is common in B, indicating that the ending is abbreviated; the part of the ending that is written is difficult to read, but it is the omicron of the third person ending with a suspension above it. ξεστοὺς] B, L, Swete, and Ziegler (meaning "hewn [of stone]"; cf. 1Macc 13:27); ξυστούς ("polished") A, Q, and Rahlfs.

(3) For this reason, thus says the Lord God, the city, out of which a thousand were going, they will be left a hundred, and the one out of which a hundred were going out, they will be left ten for the house of Israel. (4) Therefore, thus says the Lord to the house of Israel: Seek me and you will live, (5) and do not continue to seek Baithel. And do not continue to enter in to Galgala, and do not continue to cross over to the well of the oath, because Galgala as a captive will be taken into captivity, and Baithel will be as though not existing. (6) Seek the Lord and live, so that the house of Ioseph may not flame up like fire; and it would devour it, and there will be no one to quench it for the house of Israel. (7) He who executes judgment on high, he also established justice on the earth. (8) He who makes all things and transforms them, he also changes the shade into the early morning, and he darkens day into night. He who summons the water of the sea and pours it out on the surface of the earth, the Lord is his name. (9) He who dispenses ruin upon strength and brings distress upon a fortress. (10) They hated him who reproves in the gateways, and they loathed pious speech. (11) Therefore, because they were buffeting the poor with their fists and you received choice gifts from them, you have built houses of hewn stone but you will never settle down and be at home in them; you have planted desirable vineyards but you will never drink the wine from them,

- 5:12 ὅτι ἔγνωσαν πολλὰς ἀσεβείας ὑμῶν, καὶ ἰσχυραὶ αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ὑμῶν καταπατοῦσαι δίκαιον, λαμβάνοντες ἀνταλλάγματα καὶ πένητας ἐν πύλαις ἐκκλείνοντες.
- 5:13 διὰ τοῦτο ὁ συνέειν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ σιωπήσητε, ὅτι καιρὸς πονηρῶν ἐστίν.
- 5:14 ἐκζητήσατε τὸ καλὸν καὶ μὴ πονηρὸν, ὅπως ζήσητε, καὶ ἔσται οὕτως μεθ' ὑμῶν ΚΣ ὁ ΘΣ ὁ παντοκράτωρ· ὃν τρόπον εἴπατε
- 5:15 Μεμεισήκαμεν τὰ πονηρὰ καὶ ἡγαπήκαμεν τὰ καλὰ, καὶ ἀποκαταστήσατε ἐν πύλαις κρίμα, ὅπως ἐλεήσῃ ΚΣ ὁ ΘΣ ὁ παντοκράτωρ τοὺς περιλοίπους τοῦ Ἰωσήφ.
- 5:16 διὰ τοῦτο τάδε λέγει ΚΣ ὁ ΘΣ ὁ παντοκράτωρ Ἐν πάσαις ταῖς πλατείαις κοπετός, καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς ῥηθήσεται Οὐαὶ οὐαὶ· κληθήσεται γεωργὸς εἰς πένθος καὶ κοπετόν, καὶ εἰς εἰδότας θρήνον,
- 5:17 καὶ ἐν πάσαις ὁδοῖς κοπετός, διότι ἐλεύσομαι διὰ μέσου σου, εἶπεν ΚΣ.
- 5:18 οὐαὶ οἱ ἐπιθυμοῦντες τὴν ἡμέραν ΚΥ· ἴνα τί αὕτη ὑμῖν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ ΚΥ; καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν σκότος καὶ οὐ φῶς.
- 5:19 ὃν τρόπον ἐὰν φύγῃ ἄνθρωπος ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ λέοντος, καὶ ἐμπέσῃ αὐτῷ ἡ ἄρκος, καὶ εἰσπληθῇ εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπηρεῖσται τὰς χειρας αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν τοῖχον, καὶ δάκῃ αὐτὸν ὄφεις.
- 5:20 οὐχὶ σκότος ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ ΚΥ καὶ οὐ φῶς; καὶ γνόφος οὐκ ἔχων φέγγος αὕτη;
- 5:21 μεμείσηκα; ἀπώσμαι ἐορτὰς ὑμῶν, καὶ οὐ μὴ ὀσφρανθῶ θυσίας ἐν ταῖς πανηγύρεσιν ὑμῶν.

5:12 καταπατοῦσαι] B, W, and Swete (modifying and describing the sins [αἱ ἁμαρτίαι]); καταπατοῦντες A, Q*, Rahlfs, and Ziegler (modifying the subjects). ἀνταλλάγματα] B, W, and Swete have the prefix ἀντ- on ἀλλάγμα (W in singular, B and Swete in plural; the prefix emphasizes the idea of exchange, found in “ransom” in MT); ἀλλάγματα Rahlfs and Ziegler. ἐκκλείνοντες] B*; ἐκκλίνοντες B^{ab} and modern editions. 5:13 συνέειν] B*; συνίων B^{ab} and modern editions. σιωπήσητε] B*; σιωπήσεται B^{ab}, A^a, Q, and modern editions. πονηρῶν] B and Swete (“time of evil deeds”); πονηρός A, Q, Rahlfs and Ziegler (“evil time,” agreeing with the MT). 5:15 μεμεισήκαμεν] B*; Μεμεισήκαμεν B^{ab} and modern editions. 5:16 ταῖς πλατείαις ... ταῖς ὁδοῖς] B, V, and Swete include the articles before both nouns; they are absent in A Q, Rahlfs, and Ziegler; L includes the article on the first noun and omits it on the second. 5:17 ἐλεύσομαι] B, V, and Swete have the verb without a prefix. A (ἐπ-) and Q, Rahlfs, and Ziegler (δι-) have a prefix on the verb. 5:19 ἐάν] B, Q, L, Swete, and Ziegler; ὅταν A, W, V, and Rahlfs. ὄφεις] B, A, Q, W, and Swete; ὁ ὄφεις L, Rahlfs, and Ziegler (cf. the MT). 5:20 αὕτη] B and Swete; αὕτῃ Rahlfs and Ziegler. 5:21 μεμείσηκα] B*; μεμείσηκα B^{ab} and modern editions. ὀσφρανθῶ θυσίας] B, A, V, and Swete; ὀσφρανθῶ Q, Rahlfs, and Ziegler.

(12) for I know your many ungodly deeds. And your sins are weighty, even trampling upon the just man, because you are taking bribes and doing injustice to the poor in the gateways. (13) Therefore, the prudent man will be silent at that time, for it is a time characterized by evil deeds. (14) Seek the good and not evil so that you may live, and then in this way the Lord, the God, the Almighty One, will be with you. In the same way as you say, (15) "We hate the evil things, and we love the good things," also restore judgment in the gateways so that the Lord, the God, the Almighty One, may have mercy on the survivors of Ioseph. (16) Therefore, thus says the Lord, the God, the Almighty One: In all the streets there will be lamentation, and in all the roadways it will be said, Woe! Woe! The farmer will be summoned to mourning and lamentation and to those knowing a funeral dirge. (17) And in all the roadways there will be mourning, because I will pass through the midst of you, says the Lord. (18) Woe to those who desire the Day of the Lord! What is this Day of the Lord to you when it is darkness and not light? (19) Just as if a man flees from a lion, and a bear attacks him and he rushes into his house, and he places his hands upon the wall, and a snake bites him. (20) Is not the Day of the Lord darkness and not light, and is not this *Day* blackness without brightness? (21) I hate, I reject your religious festivals, and I will never savor the sacrifices in your festal gatherings.

- 5:22 διότι ἐὰν ἐνέγκητέ μοι ὀλοκαυτώματα καὶ θυσίας ὑμῶν, οὐ προσδέξομαι, καὶ σωτηρίους ἐπιφανείας ὑμῶν οὐκ ἐπιβλέψομαι.
- 5:23 μετὰστησον ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ἡχον ὧδῶν σου, καὶ ψαλμὸν ὀργάνων σου οὐκ ἀκούσομαι·
- 5:24 καὶ κυλισθήσεται ὡς ὕδωρ κρίμα, καὶ δικαιοσύνη ὡς χειμάρρους ἄβατος.
- 5:25 μὴ σφάγια καὶ θυσίας προσηνέγκατέ μοι ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ μ' ἔτη, οἶκος Ἰσραήλ;
- 5:26 καὶ ἀνελάβετε τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μόλοχ καὶ τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ θΥ ὑμῶν Ῥαιφάν, τοὺς τύπους αὐτῶν οὓς ἐποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς·
- 5:27 καὶ μετοικεῖω ὑμᾶς ἐπέκεινα Δαμασκού, λέγει ΚΣ, ὁ θΣ ὁ παντοκράτωρ ὄνομα αὐτῶ.
- 6:1 Οὐαὶ τοῖς ἐξουθενοῦσιν Σειῶν καὶ τοῖς πεποιθόσιν ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος Σαμαρείας· ἀπετρύγησαν ἀρχὰς ἐθνῶν, καὶ εἰσῆλθον αὐτοί. οἶκος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ,
- 6:2 διάβητε πάντες καὶ ἴδετε, καὶ διέλθατε ἐκείθεν εἰς Ἐμάθ Ῥαββά, καὶ κατάρβητε ἐκείθεν εἰς Γέθ ἄλλοφύλων, τὰς κρατίστας ἐκ πασῶν τῶν βασιλειῶν τούτων, εἰ πλεόνα τὰ ὄρια αὐτῶν ἐστὶν τῶν ὑμετέρων ὀρίων.
- 6:3 οἱ ἐρχόμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κακὴν, οἱ ἐγγίζοντες καὶ ἐφαπτόμενοι σαββάτων ψευδῶν,
- 6:4 οἱ καθεύδοντες ἐπὶ κλινῶν ἐλεφαντίνων καὶ κατασπαταλῶντες ἐπὶ ταῖς στρωμααῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔσθοντες ἐρίφους ἐκ ποιμνίων καὶ μοσχάρια ἐκ μέσου βουκολίων γαλαθηνά,
- 6:5 οἱ ἐπικροτοῦντες πρὸς τὴν φωνὴν τῶν ὀργάνων, ὡς ἐστηκότα ἐλογίσαντο καὶ οὐχ ὡς φεύγοντα·
- 6:6 οἱ πείνοντες τὸν διυλισμένον οἶνον, καὶ τὰ πρῶτα μύρα χρειόμενοι, καὶ οὐκ ἔπασχον οὐδὲν ἐπὶ τῇ συντριβῇ Ἰωσήφ.
- 6:7 διὰ τοῦτο νῦν αἰχμάλωτοι ἔσονται ἀπ' ἀρχῆς δυναστῶν, καὶ ἐξαρθήσεται χρεμετισμὸς ἱππων ἐξ Ἐφράιμ.

5:22 διότι ἐὰν] B, L, Swete, and Ziegler; διότι καὶ ἐὰν A, Q, W, and Rahlfs. προσδέξομαι] B, L, Swete, and Ziegler; προσδέξομαι αὐτά A, Qmg, and Rahlfs. σωτηρίους] B (†) and Swete; σωτηρίου Rahlfs and Ziegler. (This is the only instance in the MT of a singular form of the corresponding Hebrew word (סִוְיָה), referring to “peace offerings.”) 5:25 ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ] These words are in slightly different locations in the verse in different major mss, and they are omitted in a number of mss, including W, which is followed by Ziegler. In B, V, Swete, and Rahlfs these words are before “forty years,” agreeing with the MT in their location. μ' ἔτη] B and Swete (see also 2:10 and 5:3); τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη Rahlfs and Ziegler. 5:27 μετοικεῖω] B*; μετοικεῖω B^{ab} and modern editions. 6:1 Σειῶν] B*^a and Swete; Σιών A, Q^a, B^b, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. αὐτοί] B, V, W, A, Q, Rahlfs, and Swete; ἑαυτοῖς Q^a (?), some Lucianic mss, and Ziegler (closer to the MT). 6:2 κατάρβητε ἐκείθεν εἰς Γεθ] B, V, A, Swete, and Rahlfs; κατάρβητε εἰς Γεθ Ziegler, who felt the preceding occurrence of the adverb in the verse led to its addition here. πλεόνα] B, Rahlfs and Swete (see Mur, 472; Thackeray, 81 ff.); πλείονα Ziegler; πλίονα A. 6:5 ἐστηκότα] B, V, and Swete; ἐστῶτα W, A, Q, Ziegler, and Rahlfs. 6:6 πείνοντες] B*; B^{ab} and modern editions. χρειόμενοι] B*; χριόμενοι B^{ab} and modern editions.

(22) Because if you bring to me your whole-burnt-offerings and sacrifices, I will not accept *them*, and I will not respect your peace-offerings, which are outward show. (23) Take away from me the sound of your hymns, and I will not listen to a song of praise from your instruments. (24) And judgment will roll as water and righteousness as an impassable wadi. (25) You did not offer to me sacrificial victims and sacrifices in the wilderness for forty years, did you, O house of Israel? (26) And you took up the tent of Moloch and the star of your god Raiphan, the images of them, which you made for yourselves. (27) And I will lead you away captive beyond Damascus, says the Lord; his name is the God, the Almighty One.

Chapter Six

(1) Woe to those who scorn Mount Sion and to those who trust in the mountain of Samaria; they have plucked the heads of the nations, and they have entered in. (2) House of Israel, all of you cross over and see and pass through from there to Hemath Rabba and go down from there to Geth of the Philistines, the best out of all of these kingdoms; are their borders greater than your borders? (3) Those who are approaching a bad day, who are drawing near and adopting false Sabbaths, (4) who sleep upon ivory beds and behave lewdly upon their couches; and who eat kids out of the flocks and little suckling calves from amongst the herds, (5) who clap to the sound of the instruments—they considered *them* to be permanent and not fleeting things. (6) Who drink the strained wine and anoint themselves with the finest ointment, and they were not suffering anything on account of the destruction of Ioseph. (7) Therefore now, they will be captives from among the head of princes; and the neighing of horses will be removed from Ephraim.

- 6:8 ὅτι ὥμοσεν ΚΣ καθ' ἑαυτοῦ διότι Βδελύσσομαι ἐγὼ πᾶσαν τὴν ὕβριν Ἰακώβ, καὶ τὰς χώρας αὐτοῦ μεμείσηκα, καὶ ἐξαρώ πόλιν σύμπασιν τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν αὐτήν·
- 6:9 καὶ ἔσται ἐὰν ὑπολιφθῶσιν δέκα ἐν οἰκίᾳ μιᾷ, καὶ ἀποθανοῦνται καὶ ὑπολιφθήσονται οἱ κατ'ἀλοίποι,
- 6:10 καὶ λήμψονται οἱ οἰκεῖοι οἱ αὐτῶν καὶ παραβιώνται τοῦ ἐξενέγκαι τὰ ὅστα αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου· καὶ ἔρεῖ τοῖς προσεσηκόσι τῆς οἰκίας Εἰ ἔτι ὑπάρχει παρὰ σοί; καὶ ἔρεῖ Οὐκ ἔτι· καὶ ἔρεῖ Σείγα, ἔνεκα τοῦ μὴ ὀνομάσαι τὸ ὄνομα ΚΥ.
- 6:11 διότι ἰδοὺ ΚΣ ἐντέλλεται, καὶ πατάξει τὸν οἶκον τὸν μέγαν θλάσμασιν καὶ τὸν οἶκον τὸν μικρὸν ῥάγμασιν.
- 6:12 εἰ διώξονται ἐν πέτραις ἵπποι; εἰ παρασιωπήσονται ἐν θηλείαις; ὅτι ἐξεστρέψατε εἰς θυμὸν κρίμα, καὶ καρπὸν δικαιοσύνης εἰς πικρίαν,
- 6:13 οἱ εὐφρενόμενοι ἐπ' οὐδενὶ λόγῳ, οἱ λέγοντες Οὐκ ἐν τῇ ἰσχύϊ ἡμῶν ἔσχομεν κέρατα;
- 6:14 διότι ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐπεγείρω ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ, ἔθνος, λέγει ΚΣ τῶν δυνάμεων, καὶ ἐκθλείψουσιν ὑμᾶς τοῦ μὴ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς Ἐμὰθ καὶ ὡς τοῦ χειμάρρου τῶν δυσμῶν.
- 7:1 Οὕτως ἔδειξέν μοι ΚΣ ὁ Θεός, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπιγονὴ ἀκρίδων ἐρχομένη ἐωθινή, καὶ ἰδοὺ βροῦχος εἰς Γῶγ ὁ βασιλεὺς.
- 7:2 καὶ ἔσται ἐὰν συντελήσῃ τοῦ καταφαγεῖν τὸν χόρτον τῆς γῆς, καὶ εἶπα ΚΕ ΚΕ, ἰλεως γενοῦ· τίς ἀναστήσει τὸν Ἰακώβ; ὅτι ὀλιγοστός ἐστιν·
- 7:3 μετανόησον, ΚΕ, ἐπὶ τούτῳ. Καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἔσται, λέγει ΚΣ.
- 7:4 Οὕτως ἔδειξέν μοι ΚΣ, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐκάλεσεν τὴν δίκην ἐν πυρὶ ΚΣ, καὶ κατέφαγε τὴν ἄβυσσον τὴν πολλήν, καὶ κατέφαγεν τὴν μερίδα ΚΥ.

6:8 μεμείσηκα] B*; μεμίσηκα B^{ab} and modern editions. σύμπασιν] B (see Mur, 531); σὺν πᾶσιν modern editions. Swete notes the two words could possibly be divided in B with the preposition spelled with a *mem*. 6:9 ὑπολιφθῶσιν] B* (?); ὑπολειφθῶσι(ν) B^{ab} and modern editions. δέκα] B, W, and Swete; δέκα ἄνδρες A, Q, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. ὑπολιφθήσονται] B* (?); ὑπολειφθήσονται B^{ab} and modern editions. 6:10 οἱ οἰκεῖοι οἱ αὐτῶν] B (†) and Swete; οἱ οἰκεῖοι αὐτῶν Rahlfs and Ziegler. οὐκέτι] Although Swete divides these words, apparently following B, there is no evidence in B for such a division, and the accents in the text do not support a division. Σείγα] B*; Σίγα B^{ab} and modern editions. 6:13 εὐφρενόμενοι] B* (LSJ has no entry for this word, which is apparently a mistake for εὐφραινόμενοι); εὐφραινόμενοι B^{ab} and modern editions. (The original second *epsilon* has not been darkened in B, and the vowels *alpha* and *iota* are written above the original *epsilon*). 6:14 οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ] B, L, Swete, and Ziegler; οἶκος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ A, Q, W, and Rahlfs, agreeing with 6:1. ἔθνος λέγει κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων] B, V, and Swete (L has a similar reading, using synonyms for two words, and adding ὁ θεός, agreeing with the MT); ἔθνος Rahlfs and Ziegler. ἐκθλείψουσιν] B*; ἐκθλείψουσιν B^{ab} and modern editions. ὡς] B (†) and Swete; ἕως Rahlfs and Ziegler. 7:1 κύριος ὁ θεός] B, V, and Swete; κύριος A, Q, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. κύριος κύριος C. The double names are closer to the MT; cf. also 7:4, 5, 6, and 8:1. 7:2 συντελήσῃ] B*; συντελέσῃ B^c and modern editions. 7:4 μερίδα κυρίου] B V, and Swete; μερίδα A, Q, W, Rahlfs and Ziegler.

(8) For the Lord swore by himself: Because I myself loathe all the arrogance of Iakob, and I hate his regions, therefore I will remove a city with all of those inhabiting it. (9) And it shall be if ten men are left in one household, then they shall die but the survivors will be left, (10) and their kinsmen will take *them*, and they will endeavor to carry away their bones out of the house, and someone will say to the heads of the household, "Is there still anyone with you?" And someone will say, "Not any longer." And he will say, "Be silent, so as not to name the name of the Lord." (11) For, behold, the Lord commands and he will strike the great house with bruises and the little house with lacerations. (12) Will horses pursue eagerly among the rocks? Will stallions remain silent among mares? For you yourselves have perverted judgment into wrath and the fruit of righteousness into bitterness. (13) You who rejoice in what amounts to nothing, you who say, "Did we not have horns by our own power?" (14) Therefore, behold, I will raise up a nation against you, house of Israel, says the Lord of hosts, and they will oppress *you* so that you will not enter into Hemath and as far as the wadi of the west.

Chapter Seven

(1) Thus the Lord God showed me, and behold a swarm of locusts coming into action early in the morning, and behold one locust was Gog the king. (2) And it will come to pass when he finishes devouring the grass of the land, then I said, "Lord, God be merciful! Who will raise up Jacob, for he is very small in number?" (3) Repent, O Lord, concerning this!" "And this shall not be," says the Lord. (4) Thus the Lord showed me, and behold he summoned the judgment by fire, and it devoured the great deep and devoured the portion of the Lord.

- 7:5 και εἶπα ΚΕ, κόπασον δὴ· τίς ἀναστήσει τὸν Ἰακώβ; ὅτι ὀλιγοστός ἐστιν·
 7:6 μετανόησον, ΚΕ, ἐπὶ τούτῳ. Καὶ τοῦτο οὐ μὴ γένηται, λέγει ΚΣ.
 7:7 Οὕτως ἔδειξέν μοι ΚΣ, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐστηκὼς ἐπὶ τείχους ἀδάμαντινου, καὶ ἐν τῇ
 χειρὶ αὐτοῦ ἀδάμας.
 7:8 καὶ εἶπεν ΚΣ πρὸς μέ Τί σὺ ὀράς, Ἀμώς; καὶ εἶπα Ἀδάμαντα. καὶ εἶπεν ΚΣ
 πρὸς μέ Ἴδου ἐγὼ ἐντάσσω ἀδάμαντα ἐν μέσῳ λαοῦ μου Ἰσραήλ, οὐκέτι μὴ
 προσθῶ τοῦ παρελθεῖν αὐτόν·
 7:9 καὶ ἀφανισθῇσονται βωμοὶ τοῦ γέλωτος, καὶ αἱ τελεταὶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ἐρημω-
 θήσονται, καὶ ἀναστήσομαι ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἱεροβοάμ ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ.
 7:10 Καὶ ἐξαπέστειλεν Ἀμασίας ὁ ἱερεὺς Βαιθήλ πρὸς Ἱεροβοάμ βασιλέα Ἰσραήλ
 λέγων Συστροφὰς ποιεῖται κατὰ σοῦ Ἀμώς ἐν μέσῳ οἴκου Ἰσραήλ· οὐ μὴ
 δύνῃται ἡ γῆ ὑπενεγκεῖν πάντας τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ.
 7:11 διότι τάδε λέγει Ἀμώς Ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ τελευτήσῃ Ἱεροβοάμ, ὁ δὲ Ἰσραήλ
 αἰχμάλωτος ἀχθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ.
 7:12 καὶ εἶπεν Ἀμασίας πρὸς Ἀμώς Ὁ ὄρων, βάδιζε, ἐκχώρησον σὺ εἰς γῆν
 Ἰούδα, καὶ ἐκεῖ καταβίου, καὶ ἐκεῖ προφητεύσεις·
 7:13 εἰς δὲ Βαιθήλ οὐκέτι προσθήσεις τοῦ προφητεύσαι, ὅτι ἀγίασμα βασιλέως
 ἐστίν, καὶ οἶκος βασιλείας ἐστίν.
 7:14 καὶ ἀπεκρίθη Ἀμώς καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς Ἀμασίαν Οὐκ ἤμην προφήτης ἐγὼ οὐδὲ
 υἱὸς προφήτου, ἀλλ' ἦ ἐπόλος ἤμην καὶ κνίζων συκάμινᾳ.
 7:15 καὶ ἀνέλαβέν με ΚΣ ἐκ τῶν προφητῶν, καὶ εἶπεν ΚΣ πρὸς μέ Βάδιζε,
 προφήτευσον ἐπὶ τὸν λαόν μου Ἰσραήλ.
 7:16 καὶ νῦν ἄκουε λόγον ΚΥ Σὺ λέγεις Μὴ προφήτευσ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραήλ, καὶ οὐ
 μὴ ὀχλαγωγῇσεις ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰακώβ·
 7:17 διὰ τοῦτο τάδε λέγει ΚΣ Ἡ γυνή σου ἐν τῇ πόλει πορνεύσει, καὶ οἱ υἱοί
 σου καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες σου ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ πεσοῦνται, καὶ ἡ γῆ σου ἐν σχοινίῳ
 καταμετρηθήσεται, καὶ σὺ ἐν γῇ ἀκαθάρτῳ τελευτήσεις, ὁ δὲ Ἰσραήλ
 αἰχμάλωτος ἀχθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ.

7:5 κύριε] B, V, and Swete; κύριε κύριε A Q, W, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. 7:7 ἐστηκὼς] B, Q, Swete, and Ziegler; ἀνήρ ἐστηκὼς W and Rahlfs (cf. Zech 1:8; 2:1[5 MT]); κύριος ἐστηκὼς A (= MT). 7:9 ἐρημωθήσονται] B, Q, L, and Swete; ἐξερημωθήσονται A, W, Rahlfs and Ziegler. 7:12 ἐκχώρησον σὺ] B, C, and Swete; ἐκχώρησον A, Q, and Rahlfs; σὺ ἐκχώρησον L; ἐκχώρησον σοι Ziegler (= MT). 7:13 προσθήσεις] B, L, C, and Swete; μὴ προσθῇς A, Q, W, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. Cf. 7:8 and 8:2. 7:14 ἐπόλος] B*; αἰπόλος B^{ab} and modern editions. συκάμινᾳ] B*; συκάμινᾳ B^{ab} and modern editions. 7:15 προφητῶν] B (†); προβάτων modern editions. 7:16 ὀχλαγωγῇσεις] B, V, and Swete; ὀχλαγωγῆσης A, Q, Rahlfs and Ziegler; ὀχλαγωγῇ L (†).

(5) And I said, "Lord, stop, please! Who will raise up Iakob, for he is very small in number? (6) Repent, O Lord, concerning this!" "And this will never come to pass," says the Lord. (7) Thus the Lord showed me, and behold one standing on a wall of hard metal and in his hand hard metal. (8) And the Lord said to me, "What do you see, Amos?" And I said, "Hard metal." And the Lord said to me, "Behold, I am placing hard metal in the midst of my people Israel; never again will I pass by him. (9) And the altars of derision will be destroyed, and the mystic rites of Israel will be made desolate, and I will rise up against the house of Ieroboam with a sword." (10) And Amasias the priest of Baithel sent a message to Ieroboam king of Israel saying, "Amos is engaged in plots against you in the midst of the house of Israel; the land will never be able to bear all his words. (11) For this is what Amos says, 'Ieroboam will perish by the sword, while Israel will be led away captive from his land.'" (12) And Amasias said to Amos, "O seer, go, you depart into the land of Ioudas and live your life there, and you shall prophesy there. (13) But you shall not prophesy in Baithel again, for it is the king's sanctuary, and it is the royal house." (14) And Amos answered and said to Amasias, "I was not a prophet or the son of a prophet; I was nothing other than a goatherd and a scratcher of sycamore tree fruit. (15) And the Lord took me up from among the prophets, and the Lord said to me, 'Go, prophesy to my people Israel.' (16) And now hear the word of the Lord; you say, 'Stop prophesying to Israel, and never play the demagogue against the house of Iakob.' (17) Therefore, thus says the Lord, 'Your wife will be a prostitute in the city, and your sons and daughters will fall by the sword, and your land will be measured out with a measuring-line, and you will meet your end in an unclean land, while Israel will be led away captive from his land.'"

- 8:1 Οὕτως ἔδειξέν μοι ΚΣ ΚΣ, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος ἰξευτοῦ· καὶ εἶπεν Τί σὺ βλέπεις, Ἄμώς; καὶ εἶπα Ἄγγελος ἰξευτοῦ.
- 8:2 καὶ εἶπεν ΚΣ πρὸς μέ Ἦκει τὸ πέρας ἐπὶ τὸν λαόν μου Ἰσραήλ, οὐ προσθήσω ἔτι τοῦ παρελθεῖν αὐτόν.
- 8:3 καὶ ὀλολύξει τὰ φατνώματα τοῦ ναοῦ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, λέγει ΚΣ ΚΣ· πολὺς ὁ πεπτωκὼς ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, ἐπιρρίψω σιωπὴν.
- 8:4 ἀκούσατε δὴ ταῦτα οἱ ἐκτρίβοντες εἰς τὸ πρῶν πένητα, καὶ καταδυναστεύοντες πτωχοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς,
- 8:5 λέγοντες Πότε διελεύσεται ὁ μὴν καὶ ἐμπολήσομεν, καὶ τὰ σάββατα καὶ ἀνοίξομεν θησαυροὺς τοῦ ποιῆσαι μικρὸν μέτρον, καὶ τοῦ μεγαλῦναι στάθμιον καὶ ποιῆσαι ζυγὸν ἄδικον,
- 8:6 τοῦ κτᾶσθαι ἐν ἀργυρίῳ καὶ πτωχοὺς καὶ ταπεινὸν ἀντὶ ὑποδημάτων, καὶ ἀπὸ παντὸς γενήματος ἐμπορευσόμεθα;
- 8:7 ὀμνύει ΚΣ κατὰ τῆς ὑπερηφανίας Ἰακώβ Εἰ ἐπιλησθήσεται εἰς νεῖκος πάντα τὰ ἔργα ὑμῶν,
- 8:8 καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις οὐ ταραχθήσεται ἡ γῆ, καὶ πενθήσει πᾶς ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ ἀναβήσεται ὡς ποταμὸς συντέλεια, καὶ καταβήσεται ὡς ποταμὸς Αἰγύπτου.
- 8:9 καὶ ἔσται ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, λέγει ΚΣ ΚΣ, καὶ δύσεται ὁ ἥλιος μεσημβρίας, καὶ συσκοτάσει ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τὸ φῶς·
- 8:10 καὶ μεταστρέψω τὰς ἐορτὰς ὑμῶν εἰς πένθος, καὶ πάσας τὰς ψδὰς ὑμῶν εἰς θρήνον, καὶ ἀναβιβῶ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ὄσφυν σάκκον, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν κεφαλὴν φαλάκρωμα, καὶ θήσομαι αὐτόν ὡς πένθος ἀγαπητοῦ, καὶ τοὺς μετ' αὐτοῦ ὡς ἡμέραν ὀδύνης.
- 8:11 ἰδοὺ ἡμέραι ἔρχονται, λέγει ΚΣ, καὶ ἐξαποστελῶ λειμὸν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, οὐ λειμὸν ἄρτων οὐδὲ δίψαν ὕδατος, ἀλλὰ λειμὸν τοῦ ἀκοῦσαι λόγον ΚΥ·

8:1 κύριος κύριος] B and Swete (= MT; cf. 8:3 and 9); κύριος A, Q, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. 8:2 οὐ προσθήσω ἔτι] B and Swete; οὐκέτι μὴ προσθῶ A, W, Rahlfs, and Ziegler; V and Q have οὐκέτι μὴ προσθήσω; Swete claims that the original reading in Q is the same as A and W. Cf. 7:8. 8:3 ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ] B, W, L, Swete, and Rahlfs; ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ A, Q, and Ziegler. Cf. Hos 2:18; Mic 5:9. κύριος κύριος] B, V, C, Q*, and Swete (= MT); κύριος Q, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. Cf. 8:1 and 9. 8:5 λέγοντες] B, V, and Swete; οἱ λέγοντες A, Q, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. Θησαυρὸν] B, Q^{mss}, and Swete (corresponding to the sing. noun in MT); θησαυροὺς A, W, Q*, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. μικρὸν] B*; μικρὸν B^{ab} and modern editions. στάθμιον] B, L, V, and Swete; στάθμια A, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. 8:6 καὶ πτωχοὺς καὶ] B (+); πτωχοὺς modern editions. 8:7 κατὰ τῆς] B and Swete; καθ' W, Rahlfs, and Ziegler; κατ A; κατὰ V. νεῖκος] B*, W, and Rahlfs; νίκος B^{ab}, Swete, and Ziegler. Cf. 1:11 and the discussion of the same word there; in 1:11 it appears that later scribes have added the *epsilon* above the line. (It is as bold as the rest of the letters that have been traced over by a later scribe.) 8:9 κύριος κύριος] B, V, and Swete (= MT); κύριος Zeigler; κύριος ὁ θεός A, Q, and Rahlfs. Cf. 7:1. 8:11 λειμὸν] B* (3 x ??; they are obscure); λιμὸν B^{ab} (although the third occurrence is not clear) and modern editions. ἄρτων] B, Q*, and Swete; ἄρτου A Q*, Rahlfs, and Ziegler.

Chapter Eight

(1) Thus the Lord God showed me, and behold a fowler's cage. (2) And he said, "What do you see, Amos?" And I said, "A fowler's cage." And the Lord said to me, "The end has come upon my people Israel; I will not pass by him again. (3) And the coffered ceilings of the temple will wail in that day," says the Lord God. "Many will be the fallen in every place—I will inflict silence." (4) Hear this now, you who destroy a poor man in the early morning and oppress the needy from the land, (5) saying, "When will the month pass and we will do business, and the Sabbath and we will open the storehouse to make a measure small and to enlarge a standard weight and to make a balance unjust (6) to buy both the poor for money and the lowly person for sandals, and we will trade in every kind of produce?" (7) The Lord swears against the arrogance of Iakob, None of your deeds will be forgotten forever. (8) And for these things will not the land be shaken? And every one who dwells in it will mourn, and destruction will rise up like a river and it will descend like the river of Egypt. (9) And it shall be in that day, says the Lord God, and the sun will set at midday and then the daylight will become dark upon the earth. (10) And I will turn your feasts into mourning and all your songs into lament, and I will bring sackcloth on everyone's loins and baldness on every head, and I will make him as one mourning for a beloved one and those with him as those experiencing a day of grief. (11) Behold, days are coming, says the Lord, And I will send out a famine upon the land—not a famine of bread nor a thirst for water, but a famine of hearing the word of the Lord.

- 8:12 καὶ σαλευθήσονται ὕδατα τῆς θαλάσσης, καὶ ἀπὸ βορρᾶ ἕως ἀνατολῶν περιδραμοῦνται ζητοῦντες τὸν λόγον ΚΥ καὶ οὐ μὴ εὕρωσιν.
- 8:13 ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐκλείψουσιν αἱ παρθένοι αἱ καλαὶ καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ἐν δίψει,
- 8:14 οἱ ὀμνύοντες κατὰ τοῦ ἰλασμοῦ Σαμαρείας, καὶ οἱ λέγοντες Ζῆ ὁ θς σου, Δάν, καὶ ζῆ ὁ θς σου, Βηρσάβεε. καὶ πεσοῦνται καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀναστῶσιν ἔτι.
- 9:1 Εἶδον τὸν ΚΝ ἐφεστῶτα ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, καὶ εἶπεν Πάταξον ἐπὶ τὸ ἰλαστήριον καὶ σεισθήσεται τὰ πρόπυλα, καὶ διάκοιπον εἰς κεφαλὰς πάντων· καὶ τοὺς καταλοίπους αὐτῶν ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ ἀποκτενῶ, οὐ μὴ διαφύγῃ ἐξ αὐτῶν φεύγων, καὶ οὐ μὴ διασωθῇ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀνασωζόμενος.
- 9:2 ἐὰν κατακρυβῶσιν εἰς ᾄδου, ἐκείθεν ἢ χεῖρ μου ἀνασπᾷσει αὐτούς· καὶ ἐὰν ἀναβῶσιν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ἐκείθεν κατὰξω αὐτούς·
- 9:3 ἐὰν ἐγκατακρυβῶσιν εἰς τὴν κορυφὴν τοῦ Καρμήλου, ἐκείθεν ἐξερευνήσω καὶ λήμψομαι αὐτούς· καὶ ἐὰν καταδύσωσιν ἐξ ὀφθαλμῶν μου εἰς τὰ βάθη τῆς θαλάσσης, ἐκεῖ ἐντελοῦμαι τῷ δράκοντι καὶ δῆξεται αὐτούς·
- 9:4 καὶ ἐὰν πορευθῶσιν ἐν αἰχμαλωσίᾳ πρὸ προσώπου τῶν ἐχθρῶν αὐτῶν, ἐκεῖ ἐντελοῦμαι τῇ ῥομφαίᾳ καὶ ἀποκτενεῖ αὐτούς· καὶ στηριῶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου ἐπ' αὐτούς εἰς κακὰ καὶ οὐκ εἰς ἀγαθὰ.
- 9:5 καὶ ΚΣ ΚΣ ὁ θς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ ἐφαπτόμενος τῆς γῆς καὶ σαλεύων αὐτήν, καὶ πενθήσουσιν πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες αὐτήν, καὶ ἀναβήσεται ὡς ποταμὸς συντέλεια αὐτῆς, καὶ καταβήσεται ὡς ποταμὸς Αἰγύπτου·
- 9:6 ὁ οἰκοδομῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνάβασιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς θεμελιῶν, ὁ προσκαλούμενος τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ ἐκχέων αὐτὸ ἐπὶ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς· ΚΣ παντοκράτωρ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ.
- 9:7 οὐχ ὡς υἱοὶ Αἰθιοπῶν ὑμεῖς ἐσται ἐμοῦ, υἱοὶ ΙΣΛ; λέγει ΚΣ· οὐ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἀνήγαγον ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου, καὶ τοὺς ἀλλοφύλους ἐκ Καππαδοκίας, καὶ τοὺς Σύρους ἐκ βόθρου;
- 9:8 ἰδοὺ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ΚΥ τοῦ θΥ ἐπὶ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν, καὶ ἐξαρῶ αὐτὴν ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς· πλὴν ὅτι οὐκ εἰς τέλος ἐξαρῶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰακώβ, λέγει ΚΣ.

8:12 τῆς θαλάσσης] B (†) and Swete; ἕως θαλάσσης A, Q*, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. 9:2 κατακρυβῶσιν] B (†) and Swete. The scribe may have been influenced by 9:3; see the next textual note. κατορυγῶσιν Rahlfs and Ziegler. 9:3 ἐγκατακρυβῶσιν] B (†) and Swete; cf. 9:2. ἐγκρυβῶσιν A, W, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. 9:5 κύριος κύριος] B, W, V, A, Q, Swete, and Rahlfs; κύριος Ziegler (= MT). 9:6 κύριος παντοκράτωρ] B, W, V, and Swete; κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ Rahlfs and Ziegler; the MT only has *יהוה*; cf. Nah 3:5. 9:7 ἔσται] B* (accent unclear); ἐστέ B^{ab} and modern editions. ἐμοῦ] B (†) and Swete; ἐμοί A, Q, Rahlfs, and Ziegler.

(12) And the waters of the sea will be shaken violently, and from north to east people will run about in search of the word of the Lord, and they will never find it. (13) In that day the beautiful young virgins and the young men will faint with thirst, (14) those who swear by the sin-offering of Samaria and those who say, "Your god lives, Dan" and "Your god lives, Bersabee"; and they shall fall and shall never rise again.

Chapter Nine

(1) I saw the Lord standing upon the altar, and he said: Strike against the place of propitiation, and the gateways will be shaken; and cut through the heads of all. And I will slay the survivors of them with a sword; any one of them who attempts to flee will never escape, and any one of them who attempts to rescue himself will never succeed. (2) Even if they burrow down to Hades, from there my hand will drag them up; and if they ascend to heaven, I will bring them down. (3) Even if they hide in the summit of Carmel, from there I will search them out, and I will seize them. And if they should sink from my sight into the depths of the sea, there I will command the serpent, and it will bite them. (4) And if they go into captivity ahead of their enemies, there I will command the sword, and it will slay them; and I will firmly set my eyes against them for the purpose of calamities and not good things. (5) And the Lord God, the God, the Almighty One, he who takes hold of the land and shakes it so that all those inhabiting it will mourn and the destruction of it will rise up like a river, and it will descend like the river of Egypt; (6) he who builds his ascent into the heaven and establishes his promise on the earth; he who summons the water of the sea and pours it out on the surface of the earth, the Lord, the Almighty One, is his name. (7) Are you not like the sons of the Ethiopians, my sons of Israel? says the Lord. Did I not bring up Israel out of Egypt and the Philistines out of Cappadocia and the Syrians out of the pit? (8) Behold, the eyes of the Lord God are upon the kingdom of the sinners, and I will destroy it from the face of the earth; except that I will not destroy completely the house of Iakob, says the Lord.

- 9:9 διότι ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι, καὶ λικμήσω ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραὴλ ὃν τρόπον λικμάται ἐν τῷ λικνω, καὶ οὐ μὴ πέσῃ σύντριμμα ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν·
- 9:10 ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ τελευτήσουσι πάντες ἁμαρτωλοὶ λαοῦ μου, οἱ λέγοντες Οὐ μὴ ἐγγίσῃ οὐδὲ μὴ γένηται ἐφ' ἡμᾶς τὰ κακά.
- 9:11 Ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀναστήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυεὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν, καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὰ πεπτωκότα αὐτῆς, καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς ἀναστήσω, καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω αὐτὴν καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος,
- 9:12 ὅπως ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς, λέγει ΚΣ ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα.
- 9:13 ἰδοὺ ἡμέραι ἔρχονται, λέγει ΚΣ, καὶ καταλήμψεται ὁ ἄλοητός τὸν τρυγητόν, καὶ περκάσει ἡ σταφυλὴ ἐν τῷ σπόρῳ, καὶ ἀποσταλάξει τὰ ὄρη γλυκασμόν, καὶ πάντες οἱ βουνοὶ σύμφυτοι ἔσονται·
- 9:14 καὶ ἐπιστρέψω τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν λαοῦ μου Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ οἰκοδομήσουσιν πόλεις τὰς ἡφανισμένας καὶ κατοικήσουσιν, καὶ καταφυτεύσουσιν ἀμπελώνας καὶ πίονται τὸν οἶνον αὐτῶν, καὶ φυτεύσουσιν κήπους καὶ φάγονται τοὺς καρπούς αὐτῶν·
- 9:15 καὶ καταφυτεύσω αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς αὐτῶν, καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐκспаσθῶσιν οὐκέτι ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἧς ἔδωκα αὐτοῖς, λέγει ΚΣ ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ.

9:9 ἐγὼ] B, V, and Swete; ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ A, Q, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. λικμήσω “normalized” reading (from λικμάω)] B, L, and Swete; λικμιῶ (λικμίζω) Q, W, A^a, Rahlfs and Ziegler. The two verbs have the same meaning (Mur, 346). The original of A omits the κ. Note the discussion of the Attic future forms in C & S, § 21. οἶκον Ἰσραὴλ] B, Q, L, Swete, and Ziegler; οἶκον τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ A, W, and Rahlfs. λικνῶ] B, and W (from λίκνον = λικμός); λικμῶ Q and modern editions. 9:10 οὐδὲ μὴ] B, L, and Swete; οὐδ' οὐ μὴ A, Q, W, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. 9:11 Δαυεὶδ] B and Swete; Δαυιδ Rahlfs and Ziegler. 9:12 κύριος] B, L, Q, Ziegler and Swete (= MT); κύριος ὁ θεός A, W, and Rahlfs. 9:13 ἀμητός] B, Q, and W; ἀμητός Swete (seems to have the wrong accent; see Mur, 23; Walters, 95, 226–227); ἀλοητός A, Q^a, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. Cf. Lev 26:5 and the variant there. 9:14 ἀμπελώνας] B (†), and Swete; ἀμπελώνας B^{ab}, Rahlfs, and Ziegler. τοὺς καρπούς] B, W, and Swete; τὸν καρπὸν Rahlfs and Ziegler. 9:15 τῆς γῆς 2^o] B, W (?), and Swete; τῆς γῆς αὐτῶν Rahlfs and Swete.

(9) For I will give an order, and I will winnow the house of Israel among the nations, just as *grain* is winnowed with a winnowing fan, and destruction shall never fall upon the land. (10) All the sinners of my people will perish by the sword who say, "Calamities will never approach or come upon us." (11) In that day I will raise up the tent of Daud, which has fallen, and I will build up the collapsed parts of it, and I will raise up the ruined parts of it, and I will build it up as in the remote past (12) so that the remnant of people and all the nations upon whom my name is called upon them may seek *me*, says the Lord, who accomplishes these things. (13) Behold, days are coming, says the Lord, when the reaping shall last up to the vintage, and the grapes shall ripen at seedtime, and the mountains shall drip sweetness, and all the hills shall be thickly planted. (14) And I will bring back the captivity of my people Israel, and they will build the cities which had been destroyed, and they will inhabit *them*, and they will plant a vineyard, and they will drink their wine, and they will plant gardens, and they will eat the fruits of them. (15) And I will plant them in their land, and they will never again be dragged out of the land, which I gave to them, says the Lord, the God, the Almighty One.

COMMENTARY

A. 1:1–2:3

Introduction and Oracle against Damascus, 1:1–5

In Vaticanus Amos is divided into six sections by Greek capital letters in the left column (*beta* through *digamma*). A scribe has written an *alpha* on the left above the first line to mark the first section of the book. (See the discussion of this in the Introduction, pp. 6–7). Amos 1:1 is the title of the book, and 1:2 summarizes the message of the book. The remainder of the first two chapters is a series of eight judgment oracles against Israel and its neighboring Syro-Palestinian states (major powers like Egypt, Assyria, and Babylon are not included); the oracles zero in on Judah (2:4–5) and finally Israel (2:6–16). In B the first oracle which is against Damascus or Syria (1:3–5) and the introductory verses (1–2) are all one paragraph. Furthermore in the LXX Amos 1:3–5 is connected with 1:2 by two renderings in 1:3 that are unique in the judgment oracles. The phrase that introduces each of these eight oracles in chapters 1–2 (כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה) is rendered καὶ εἶπεν κύριος. This is the only time this phrase is rendered with a καὶ in Amos and the only time the verb is rendered in the aorist tense. The result is that the oracle against Damascus, beginning in verse 3, becomes a continuation of the summary of what Amos “said” (εἶπεν) in 1:2 (Park, 169–170). This and several other differences from the Hebrew throughout the book suggest the translator had Syria and Damascus on his mind and that the judgment summarized in 1:2 in the summary of the book is especially focused on the inhabitants of that region, who probably would have been the Seleucids when the translation was made (Glenny, 149–184). Thus, in B all of 1:1–5 introduces the book.

The title in 1:1, “The words of Amos,” is modified by two relative clauses, both describing further these “words.” The first clause, modifying the “words,” explains where these words came to Amos, and the second clause indicates that Amos “saw” these words, perhaps referring to visions like those described in chapters 7–9 (see Isa 1:1; Ezek 1:1; and esp. Amos 7:12). The description of the “word coming” to the prophet in the first clause (using a form of γίνομαι) is typical of the first verse of the prophets in the LXX (Jer, Hos, Joel, Jonah, Mic, Zeph, Hag, and Zech), and this may explain the emphasis on this fact in Amos (note the similar added emphasis in the LXX translation of Jer 1:1).

To say that the words “came” to the prophet emphasizes that the “words” are from God (Jer 1:1–4).

The “words” of the prophecy came to Amos “in Accarim in Thecoue,” and they are what “he saw.” The prepositional phrases following “which he saw” (ὅς εἶδεν), the second relative clause, give the content of what he saw and the time he saw it. Of importance is the fact that the visions that Amos “saw,” and by implication the “words” that described them, were “concerning Jerusalem.” (See Joel 1:3; Jonah 4:10; Nah 1:14; and esp. Mic 1:1 for parallel uses of ὑπέρ. BDAG, 1031, calls this use a “marker of general content, whether of a discourse or mental activity.”) According to the MT Amos sees a vision about “Israel” (see also 7:14–15), but in all of the Greek tradition of 1:1 the vision is about Jerusalem. (Harper’s suggestion [2] that this reading in the Greek texts is probably a result of the translator “confusing similar abbreviations” is highly unlikely; see Park, 177, n. 66.) The phrase “concerning Jerusalem” eases any problem of references to “Jerusalem” (1:2; 2:5), “Judah” (2:4, 5; 7:12), “tent of David” (9:11), or “Zion” (1:2 and esp. 6:1) later in the book (Dines, 42). However, at the same time it creates seeming tension with the clear focus on and address to Israel throughout the book. Park concludes, “The original word against Israel is replaced with (salvific) word concerning Jerusalem, which in turn signified the undefined corporate personality of the believing community” (177). It may be, as Park concludes, that since Jerusalem is not named again in 1:3–9:15 it indicates the translator understood it symbolically to refer to the believing community, rather than physically (177). At any rate, the content of the *Vorlage* does not allow extensive development of a “salvific word” in the translation (except in 9:11–15), but the judgment against Israel, which is the theme in the Hebrew, is directed more against Syria and Damascus in the LXX.

Amos 1:2 is a summary of Amos’ message, and Amos is apparently the speaker. The aorist tenses throughout the verse and the description of events suggest that the summary was made after the fact, not as a prophecy beforehand (cf. the future time in the Hebrew). Following the introduction, “And he said,” the verse involves two pairs of parallel clauses. The first pair describes the Lord speaking from Jerusalem, and the second pair describes the effects of his voice. The imagery in the verse locates the Lord in “Sion,” apparently in the temple in Jerusalem, which is his proper dwelling place or sanctuary on earth (Jer 32:30; Joel 3:17). The only other occurrence of “Sion” in Amos (6:1) is a pronouncement of woe on “those who are despising Sion” (cf. the Hebrew, “at ease in Zion”). The descriptions of the Lord speaking in 1:2a suggest that the Lord is crying out in an inaudible voice, but 1:2b indicates he actually is speaking through the judgments described there. The first two

clauses (1:2a) are a translation of the exact Hebrew found also in Joel 4:16, and the two passages are translated exactly the same with one exception: Joel has the verb ἀνακράζω rather than φθέγγομαι in the first clause. Both terms can be used of human or animal utterance (LSJ), and in both instances the translator is apparently trying to avoid an awkward anthropomorphism (toning down the Heb “will roar” נָאָה; but note that the Lord does “roar” in LXX-Hos 11:10). The verb, φθέγγομαι, occurs three times in the Twelve (see Nah 2:8; Hab 2:11, both referring to animals uttering sounds). The second description of the Lord’s speaking in this verse, “uttered his voice” (lit. “gave his voice”; see 3:4), is often connected with his miraculous deeds and manifestations of his power, such as thunder, hail, and earthquakes. The drought situation that is described in the second half of the verse was the result of God’s speech. Personified nature, “the pastures,” mourned, and the lushest spot in the land, “the summit of Carmel,” dried up. The “pastures” and the “summit of Carmel” constitute a merism (north/south, low/high, or minimal vegetation/fertile), “implying the total devastation of all fertile places” (Paul, 40).

Amos 1:3–5 is the first of the eight woe oracles against the nations in chapters 1–2. They all begin with a similar formula, “Thus says the Lord, on account of the three ungodly acts of ... and on account of the four, I will not turn away from it, because of” There are four exceptions to this pattern. First, as mentioned above, 1:3 begins with καί rather than the normal τὰδε (“thus”), perhaps to introduce the section and more likely to connect it with the preceding verses. Second, the noun υἱῶν (“sons”) is added to the designation of the nation in 1:13 (following Hebrew) and 2:4 (not in Hebrew). Third, the object of the verb “I will not turn away from” is always in the third person, masculine, singular in the Hebrew, but the LXX differs from the Hebrew in 1:6, 11 (third, masculine, plural) and 1:9 (third, feminine, singular). Fourth, the translator varies the way that he translates the identical causal phrase in the Hebrew. In the LXX the prepositions ἀνθ’ ὧν (1:3, 9, 13; 2:1, 6) and ἐνεκεν-α (1:6, 11; 2:4) are used alternatively to show the cause of the Lord’s judgment of the nations (“because”). The translator always uses an aorist or imperfect verb to describe the crime following ἀνθ’ ὧν and a genitive articular infinitive following ἐνεκεν-α. The pronouns with the infinitives or the verbs in the descriptions of the crimes are always third person plural in the LXX, varying twice from the MT (1:11 [“he” to “they”] and 2:1 [“he” to “they”]). The two different prepositional constructions would have had a slightly different sense to the sophisticated reader; in classical Greek the construction ἀνθ’ ὧν often refers to something preceding that is the antecedent of the relative pronoun (LSJ, 140), whereas with ἐνεκεν-α its genitive object, which could follow or precede it, is the cause. In the LXX there is no difference between

the constructions, as indicated by their use in this passage (see BDF, § 208 for a list of Hebrew causal constructions rendered by $\alpha\nu\theta'$ $\omega\nu$ in the LXX; Mur, 42).

The changes the translator makes in this causal construction are an important literary variation in the stock formula at the beginning of the judgment oracles. Dines (*The Septuagint*, 54–57) suggests that the two different causal constructions in the Greek are so arranged that they form an inclusio, with $\alpha\nu\theta'$ $\omega\nu$, at the beginning and end and also at the center, although it is difficult to have a center position with eight units. This variation indicates that the translator, although generally literal, was not bound to an “interlinear approach” in his translation; he is trying to make the passage interesting to his reader (Dines, *The Septuagint*, 54–57).

The reason for the punishment pronounced in each of the oracles is the “ungodly acts” ($\alpha\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\beta\epsilon\iota\alpha$) of the nation addressed. This word has the idea of “ungodliness” or “impiety” and can refer to these sins in the abstract, but here where the text speaks of “three” and “four” and then goes on to list at least one act, it is best to translate it as “ungodly acts.”

Throughout this series of oracles the use of the article with cardinal numbers is surprising (“the three” and “the four”). This is not an indication of the translator’s desire to follow closely his *Vorlage*, since the Hebrew does not have the article; instead it suggests that he wanted to emphasize three and four specific “ungodly acts.” When the article occurs with cardinal numbers in the LXX, apparently the translator understands the things referred to by the number to be definite (Lev 25:21; Num 12:4 and 35:14; 3 Kgdms 7:13, 25; 2 Chr 4:4; 2 Esd 10:9). The article is not used elsewhere in the LXX with cardinal numbers in numerical sayings (cf. Prov 30:15, which is a demonstrative construction). The significance of such definiteness here is difficult to determine (see Smith, 69–70). Parallel to the Babylonian Talmud it could indicate that it is bad enough that the nations have committed three sins, but when they commit four that cannot be forgiven. (See Yoma 86b, which says “If a man commits a transgression the first, second and third time, he is forgiven; the fourth time he is not forgiven,” and quotes Amos 2:6.) Or the articles could indicate that three and four are components of seven, symbolizing completeness. This last understanding of the articles would make the sins of the other nations as numerous as the seven sins of Israel and Israel as bad as the other nations (2:6–8; see also the lists of seven elsewhere in Amos, 2:14–16; 4:6–12; 9:1–4).

Each of the oracles contains the clause “I will not turn away from” ($\sigma\upsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha\pi\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\eta}\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$). These are the only eight occurrences of this verb in LXX-Amos. In the oracles this verb means that the Lord will not “relent” or “stop” his judgment of the addressee. The corresponding Hebrew verb always has

a third person, masculine, singular suffix; the LXX varies the object in three of the eight occurrences of this construction, changing it to third person, masculine, plural in 1:6 and 11 and third person, feminine, singular in 1:9. If one translates this verb “relent” or “stop,” it is difficult to include the object of the verb in the translation. The translation used here, “I will not turn away from it/them/her,” is preferred because it indicates the object of the verb. The oracles sometimes end with “says the Lord” (1:5, 8, 15; 2:1, 16), and sometimes this clause is absent (1:10, 11; 2:4), always following the Hebrew in this regard.

“Fire” is the stereotypical judgment in all these oracles. Seven of the eight judgment oracles speak of judgment by fire (the final oracle addressed to Israel being the exception). With one exception this judgment by fire is described with the same words both in the Hebrew and B in the seven oracles that contain it (1:4, 7, 10, 12, 14; 2:2, 5): “I will send out fire ... and it shall devour the foundations.” (In 1:14, following the Hebrew, B has “I will kindle a fire.”) The repetition of the prepositional prefix ἐκ in the verbal expression would remind the reader that the Lord is sending judgment ἐκ Σιων and ἐξ Ιερουσαλημ in verse 2, and it would suggest to the reader that the Lord is sending the judgment fire in the first seven oracles from Jerusalem also. The fire is always “sent out” (or “kindled,” 1:14) to devour the “foundations” (θεμέλια) of the place being judged (1:4, 7, 10, 14; 2:5) or the foundation of its walls (1:12), or the foundations of its cities (2:2). To the reader of B θεμέλια would have meant “something solid at the base, supporting that which is above it” (Mur, 257), and the judgment on the θεμέλια would indicate the total destruction of what these nations had built and all that supports their civilization and culture.

The translator varies the preposition he uses to modify the recipient of the judgment fire. Whereas the MT always has the preposition *beth*, the LXX varies between εἰς (1:4, 12) and ἐπὶ (1:7, 10, 14; 2:2, 5). The fire is directed against various recipients: “the house” (1:4), “the walls” (1:7, 10, 14), “Thaiman” (1:12), “Moab” (2:2), and “Ioudas” (2:5). However there seems to be no consistent relationship between the prepositions used and their objects that explains why the translator varied the prepositions. As with the causal connectors listed above, it appears that the translator was trying to vary the literary form so the text did not become monotonous for his readers. Both Greek prepositions could have the sense “destined for” (Mur, 150, 210); however, that translation gives the impression that the judgment is open to the future and not accomplished. Especially from the viewpoint of the translator and his readers, the judgment is past. I have translated both prepositions “against” to try to convey the hostile sense of the action (BDAG, 290, 4, c, a; Mur, 210).

("Into" is another possible translation of εἰς [BDAG, 288], but it does not make sense with the objects "house of Azael" [a dynasty?] and "Thaiman" [a people or country].) As mentioned above, the one exception to this translation is in 1:14, where the LXX text reads "I will kindle a fire"; here I have translated the preposition "upon," because it seems more appropriate. To translate both prepositions the same, where the construction is the same, is consistent with the translator's apparent interchange of them to provide literary variation but not to indicate any difference in meaning.

The reason for the judgment on Damascus in 1:3–5 is that they sawed the pregnant women of the Galaadites with iron saws (see 1:13 and the similar construction in 1 Chron 20:3). This reading is now attested at Qumran ([ד]גילע [הריו]ת) in 5QAm(4)1; the script of this manuscript is dated from the 1st century CE (DJD 3/1 [Baillet, Milik, and de Vaux], 173, plate xxxvi, line 4). Paul (47) suggests that this reading, which differs from the MT, is "an example of internal textual harmonization based on Amos 1:13." Gilead is in the north of Israel near Syria, and it would have born the brunt of the brutality of war with Syria; the exact time of the brutality described in this section of the text is unclear.

The parallel dynastic titles "house of Hazael" and "the foundations of the son of Hader" should probably be understood as references to Syria. Ben Hadad is normally translated "Ben Hader" or "son of Hader" in the LXX (3 Kgdms 11:14, 17, 18–20; 15:20; 21:1; etc), with the single exception of 3 Kgdms 21:17 (20:17 MT) where it is rendered "king of Syria." Furthermore, every one of the thirty-nine times that "Ben Hader" or "Hader" occurs in the LXX it is a translation of Ben Hadad or a translation of a pronoun referring to Ben Hadad.

In verse 5 the proclamation of judgment proceeds from Damascus ("bars" of the gates by synecdoche entail the gates) to other centers of power in the Syrian empire and indicates defeat by military force. "On" is explicitly connected with "Heliopolis" in Gen 41:50 where the LXX has "Potiphar the priest of Heliopolis" instead of "On" in MT (note also Jer 50:13 and the LXX plus in Exod 1:11). Heliopolis was located at the southern tip of the Nile Delta in Egypt and was the main cult center of Re, the sun-god (see LXX-Ezek 30:17 and ABD, 1:529). However, in this context it must refer to a city in Syria, and Greek readers would have probably understood it to refer to Baalbek, the cult center in Lebanon, dedicated to Baal, since Greek and Roman authors called Baalbek Heliopolis (Paul, 53). In the third or second century BCE the town and shrine were renamed with the same name as the Egyptian sacred city, Heliopolis, or "City of the Sun" (ABD, 1:556; Smith, 62). The reader of the LXX would probably understand the tribe that the Lord will destroy in "Charran" to be Haran in northern Mesopotamia where Abraham lived for a time (Gen

11:31, 32; 12:4, 5; 27:43; 28:10). In 4 Kgdms 19:12 and Isa 37:12 it is listed with Eden among the cities defeated by the Assyrians, and in Ezek 27:23 it is listed among the people that traded with Tyre, including again Eden. (See BDAG, 1081, for more references.)

The final description of the judgment of Syria at the end of 1:5 is stated in the passive voice and describes the “captivity” of the “alien people of Syria.” Elsewhere in the LXX ἐπικλητος, rendered “alien,” has the meaning of “appointed” or “designated” (Josh 20:9); “called” in the sense of “famous” or “renowned” (Num 11:16; 26:9); or “convocation” (Num 28:18, 26; 29:1, 7, 12). (The last usage is especially difficult, and *La Bible d’Alexandrie* has translated the word as “jour d’appel” or “day of convocation” in Num 28 and 29, allowing ἐπικλητος to have its normal function as an adjective and adding the noun “day” to try to make sense of the passage and still be loyal to the meaning of the Greek word.) Mur (216) suggests the meaning “bearing the name of” in Amos 1:5, and thus the phrase would read something like “the people bearing the name of Syria.” There are no other LXX occurrences of the word that fit Muraoka’s suggested definition, and the normal Greek rendering of it is “called,” “designated,” or “appointed,” although the sense of “called” is first century BCE and later (LSJ, 638–639). The word often has a negative connotation; Herodotus (*Hist.* 5.75; 7.203) and Thucydides (4.61) used it for people from abroad, who were summoned or called on as mercenaries; Plutarch (*Moralia* 2.707a) used it for secondary or supernumerary guests, who were not invited by the host but by one of his honored guests (LSJ, 638–639). (See the lengthy discussion of this word in Dines, 59–62. She comments [62], “These were obviously regarded as second-class guests. ... The custom has to do specifically with distinguished *foreign* guests, whose entourage might not be known to the host. The practice was apparently regarded as something of a necessary evil.”) In some contexts the word has the connotation of foreign or barbaric and is the opposite of ἐπιχώριος, “native” (Dionysius of Halicarnassus 6.53.1; cf. also 2.76 and Josephus, *A.J.* 15.2.5; and see LSJ, 639). In the negative context of 1:5 the word modifies the “people” (λαός) of Syria, which refers to another group of Syrians in addition to those mentioned earlier in the verse, likely the “foreigners” or “aliens” who had invaded Israel, and perhaps the enemies of the “Jerusalem” in 1:2.

Oracle against Philistia, 1:6–8

This oracle addresses primarily Gaza (1:6–7) and then names three of the other four main “Philistine cities” in verse 8, omitting only Gath. Nebuchadnezzar defeated the Philistines (597 and 586 BCE), and many of them were

deported to Babylon; by the Persian period (539 BCE) the Philistine culture had disappeared (ABD 5:328), and after Alexander's conquests (332 BCE) Azotus, Ashkelon, and Gaza were in every respect Hellenized.

The LXX updates place names in 1:6 ("Edom" to "Idumea"; "Edom" is always "Idumea" in the Twelve [7×], except in Amos 9:12) and in 1:8 ("Ashdod" to "Azotus"). The Greek work ἀλλόφυλος ("strangers") is apparently another LXX updating, partly influenced by what had happened to the former Philistia. On the basis of its constituent parts it means "of another tribe" (Mur, 20), but it is employed almost exclusively to render יִשְׁלָח in the LXX from Judges on; thus, it is difficult to know how a reader of the LXX would have understood it (Tov, "Three Dimensions," 91–92; see NETS, 781, which chooses the generic "allophytes" to render this word in the Twelve). Tov suggests that the resemblance between ἀλλόφυλος and φυλιστιειμ (the term corresponding to יִשְׁלָח in the Hexateuch) in some way influenced this lexical choice. In that regard "tribe" (φυλή) in "tribe from Ascalon" is also related to ἀλλόφυλος and precedes it in 1:8. I have rendered ἀλλοφύλων in 1:8 "foreigners," because even though the cities mentioned suggest it refers to the "Philistines," especially to someone who knows the *Vorlage*, the word would not have had that definite of a reference to the original reader; in Jewish writings the word has the sense of non-Jew or foreigner (BA, 23.4–9, 73; see 1 Macc 5:15 where it must mean foreigner or Gentile).

Verse 6 begins with the typical introductory formula for the eight judgment oracles. The sin of Gaza is that "they led captive the captives of Salomon to confine them in Idumea." The phrase "captives of Salomon" emphasizes that the Philistines were sending Israelites, apparently from Judah, into captivity to Idumea. (On the tradition of Solomon's captivity see 1:9 and Dines, 68, n. 68). Muraoka (Mur, 13) suggests that in the unique contexts in 1:6 and 9 αἰχμαλώσια is best understood as the collective "captives," a common translation of this word (Num 31:12; 2 Chr 28:5; Ezek 39:25), rather than "captivity," resulting in the phrase "captives of Salomon." Perhaps the collaboration of Tyre and Sidon with the Philistines in the selling of the people of Judea to the Greeks, described in Joel 3:4–8 [4:4–8 Eng], influenced the translator in his translation of מְלֶכֶךְ ("whole") as "Salomon" in these two oracles (1:6, 9). The result is further focus on people connected with Jerusalem (1:1). The oracle prophesies of complete destruction: "and the survivors of the foreigners will be destroyed." This could refer to the destruction of the cities not included in the list in 1:6–8, like Gath, which 6:2 implies has been defeated already (cf. 4 Kgdms 12:17–18), or it could refer to the destruction of the remainder of the "foreigners" who inhabit this area. The plurals "inhabitants"

and “survivors” in 1:8 support the latter understanding. “Tribe” in verse 8 refers to a “community of people” that is “united by local habitation” (MUR, 723–724).

Oracle against Tyre, 1:9–10

The oracle against the Phoenicians is addressed solely to Tyre, with no reference to Sidon or any other Phoenician city. This is the only oracle addressed solely to a city-state. Two explicit sins of Tyre are mentioned. In the LXX the first sin of Tyre is clearly committed against Judea, i.e., “Salomon’s captives”; furthermore in Vaticanus, Solomon’s captives are confined in “Ioudea,” rather than “into Idumea.” (See the discussion of the renderings “Salomon” and “captives” above in 1:6.) Tyre’s second sin, unfaithfulness to “the covenant between brothers,” is against an unnamed people, but in the LXX the preceding context suggests that it is also against Judea. There is reference to a covenant between Tyre (Hiram) and Judea (Solomon) in 3 Kgdms 5:1–12 (see also 3 Kgdms 5:26; 9:10–14; 2 Kgdms 5:11; 3 Kgdms 16:31). Muraoka translates “covenant between brothers” as “fraternal agreement” (Mur, 115), thus weakening the covenant idea. Cyril (425D–428B) links this passage with Tyre’s sin against Judah in Joel 3:4–7. However, 1 Macc 5:15 hints at an “anti-Jewish movement in the Phoenician cities during the time of the Maccabean wars” (Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 89); in that text messengers from Galilee announce to Judas Maccabee and his brothers that “people of Ptolemais and Tyre and Sidon, and all Galilee of the Gentiles, had gathered together against them ‘to annihilate us’” (NRSV). Also van der Kooij discusses the apparent interest the pro-Hellenistic priests Jason and Menelaos had in Tyre, described in 2 Macc 4:18–19 and 32 (see van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, 101–103). He suggests such factors may have led to the thinking that Phoenician cities like Tyre were to blame for the Hellenization of Jerusalem and the Temple.

Oracle against Idumea, 1:11–12

This oracle is the first of three consecutive oracles against Israel’s kin. After the Nabataeans captured Mt. Seir with its capital, Petra, in 300 BCE, the Edomites pressed into the then empty lands west of the Arabah; this land came to be known by the Greek name Idumea and the people were called the Idumeans (1 Macc 4:29, 61; 5:65). The LXX consistently translates Edom with the Greek “Idumea.”

The varying pronouns in this oracle make interpretation of it complex (αὐτούς, αὐτοῦ, αὐτῆς). The text has four parallel phrases in the latter half of

verse 11, describing specific sins of Idumea. In the first specific sin mentioned, pursuing “his brother” with the sword, the brother is not identified, but the description would remind the reader of Israel’s pre-conquest encounter with Edom (Num 20:14–21, esp. “brothers” in 20:14). Israel and Edom are often called “brothers” in Scripture (Gen 25:19 ff.; 27:40–41; Deut 2:4; 23:7–8; Obad 10, 12; see also Stuart, 313). However, the LXX could refer to the warfare between Judas and the descendants of Esau in Idumea in ca. 164 BCE, shortly after the rededication of the Temple, because the Idumeans kept ambushing the Israelites in Idumea (1 Macc 5:1–3), the area around Hebron (1 Macc 4:29, 61; 5:65). I have translated the next clause, “he ravaged *his* mother in the land,” understanding “mother” to be parallel to “brother” in the preceding clause and the clause to refer to the ongoing animosity between Edom and Israel. (See the textual notes on “mother,” the reading in B.) It seems reasonable that a reader would supply a possessive pronoun (“his”) to modify “mother,” since all the other objects of the verbs in the four parallel clauses in 1:11b are so modified. The Greek then adds the phrase, “upon the ground” or “in the land,” depending on the understanding of ἐπὶ γῆς (note the similar expression in Gen 38:9; and see Paul, 65, n. 219). The LXX translator added these two words, and the phrase apparently refers to the motherland or the land of the mother. This is consistent with the expansion of Edom into southern Israel after 300 BCE. The Greek verb, λυμάνω, sometimes has the connotation of sexual violence in the LXX (Ezek 16:25; 4 Macc 18:8; see also Jud 9:2), and for texts with the reading “womb” (rather than “mother”) that connotation might be appropriate here. However, the text of B suggests a more general translation, referring to violence and destruction.

The last two descriptions of Edom’s sins denounce its relentless fury and wrath. The translation of the third clause detailing Edom’s sins, “and he seized his trembling anger for a proof,” is awkward. The noun φόβη means “trembling fear” or “trembling anger.” The clause indicates that the strong and persistent anger of Edom is a witness against the nation.

The final clause detailing Edom’s sinful behavior continues the description of its wrath, “He preserved his violent impulse forever.” The prepositional phrase εἰς νῆκος is ambiguous (see also 8:7). Should it be understood “forever, permanently” following closely the meaning of the MT in Amos 1:11 (Kraft, 153–156) or “until victory is won” (Caird, “Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint. II,” 136)? The phrase εἰς νῆκος in Amos 1:11 should probably be understood to mean “forever, permanently.” First and most important, the context of Amos 1:11 seems confused if εἰς νῆκος is rendered “until victory is won” or “until victory.” This would attribute “victory” to Edom in a judgment oracle on Edom. Second, the phrase has the idea of “forever, permanently” in 2 Kgdms

2:26 and Jer 3:5 (Amos 8:7 is also difficult, see below), and the Old Latin and the Armenian version “understood the phrase to mean ‘for ever’” (Mur, 387). Thus, it is likely that readers of LXX-Amos would be familiar with this idiom (Kraft, 155–156). The phrase emphasizes that Edom holds on to its “violent impulse” permanently. The Greek word for “violent impulse” (δρμημα) has the idea of “impulse” (LSJ, 1253) or “impulsive aggression” (LEH, 339; cf. Exod 32:22). In Hos 5:10 and Hab 3:8 it refers to God’s wrath. As in the previous clause the description of Edom’s anger gives a “highly charged” picture (Dines, 70). Finally, as a result of Edom’s sins the Lord will send fire against Thaiman to consume it. (See the discussion in Glenny, 125–126.) Thaiman and Bozrah (which is mentioned in the MT of 1:12) lay along the ancient King’s Highway that ran from Damascus to the Gulf of Aqaba; Bozrah being the northernmost city or region in Edom and Thaiman being the southernmost. Of the five passages in which תַּיִמָן (Thaiman) occurs in the Twelve, once it is rendered by “southern” (Zech 6:6), three times by the name “Thaiman” (Amos 1:12; Obad 9; Hab 3:3), and once by “of his threat” (Zech 9:14; ἀπειλῆς αὐτοῦ).

Oracle against Ammon, 1:13–15

Ammon was Israel’s neighbor to the northeast, bordering Gilead and Aram. The description of their sin, “ripping up the pregnant women,” uses a common “cliché in the ancient Near East and beyond for the terrors of merciless warfare” (Stuart, 314; 4 Kgdms 8:12; 15:16; Hos 13:16). This sin is similar to the sin of Damascus mentioned in 1:3. The Ammonites often fought with the Gileadites, attempting to gain parts of fertile Gilead for themselves (Judg 3:12–14; 10:7–9, 17; 11:4–33; 1 Kgdms 11:1–11; 14:47; 2 Kgdms 8:12; 10:1–11; 2 Chr 20:1–30; 24:26). The imperfect tense verb in the LXX (“were ripping”) suggests a pattern of wrongs. “[S]o that they might widen their own borders” emphasizes their selfishness. In verse 14 instead of “sending out fire” against Ammon, as the judgment is described in the other oracles (1:4, 7, 10, 12; 2:2, 5) with the exception of the oracle against Israel, the Lord “kindles a fire on the walls of Rabba.” The best understanding of the last clause in 1:14 in Codex B is probably, “and she will be shaken in the days it will destroy her” (see text notes; Glenny, 126; Dines, 71; Wolff, 161, n. aa). This has the same sense as the reading found in most editions, “in the day of her destruction.” The earthquake imagery in the LXX may be related to the Day of the Lord. As in the previous judgment oracles, references to the subject, here Ammon, vary between singular and plural (esp. in 1:13–14; note also the changes from masc. to fem. references).

In verse 15 the Lord declares that the leaders of Ammon, along with their priests and their rulers, will go into captivity. (See the extended discussion in Glenn, 157–160; also de Waard, 116, and Dines, 74–77.) In this verse the noun αἰχμαλωσία has its more normal sense, “captivity” (see also 4:10; 9:4, 14), rather than “captives,” as in the unique construction in 1:6 and 9.

As de Waard insists, we must consider “the total discourse of the message” (113), and this suggests that this verse must be related to Ammon and Ammonite rulers (see the parallel in Jer 30:19b [49:3 MT]). Dines (78–79) discusses how the recent history of Ammon might help understand the meaning of this passage in the Greek text. I will try to summarize her development of a possible historical connection. She notes that LSJ permits the sense “ruler” for βασιλεύς, thus allowing the sense “her rulers” for the words normally translated “her kings” in this verse. Also, in the phrase “their priests and their rulers,” the antecedent of “their” is apparently the nearer “her kings,” rather than the more distant “the sons of Ammon” (113); this means that “their priests and their rulers” are subordinate to the “kings” and suggests that the “kings” are a “superior kind of ruler.” Ammon was the homeland of the powerful Tobiad clan, which was known to be hostile to Jerusalem (2 Esd 12:10, 19; esp. 14:9–15; 16:17–19). Dines suggests that the Ammonite rulers described in this verse in the LXX are “most likely the Tobiad supporters of Antiochus Epiphanes and allies among the Jerusalem priesthood” (82). This makes sense of the plural noun forms, “their priests and their rulers,” in 1:15b. It is also consistent with the account of Josephus (*A.J.*, 12.239 ff.) that the members of the Tobiad clan, although related to the high priestly family of Oniad, backed Menelaus, the outsider, in his approaches to Epiphanes. Thus, the Tobiads as a whole were supporting the party in Jerusalem they felt was the most likely to succeed with Antiochus, who was growing in power. Perhaps such an “alliance between influential ‘Ammonites’ and ‘Hellenizing’ Jerusalem priests” (Dines, 79) was behind the references to “her kings,” “their priests,” and “their rulers” in 1:15. Strong feelings against the Hellenizers, like those suggested here in Amos 1:15, are clear in Maccabees (2 Macc 4:7–17; 5:15). Other translations in the Twelve like Hab 1:7 (φοβερὸς καὶ ἐπιφανής ἐστιν ἐξ αὐτοῦ) suggest that contemporary situations, and in that verse Antiochus Epiphanes, were never far from the minds of the translators.

Sawyer’s suggestion (130, n. 34) that 1:15 refers to the “Damascus” sect of Qumran (*CD* VI–VII), as he argues 3:12 does, makes sense of the addition of “priests” in both passages (see 3:13), but it founders in 1:15 because of the plural “kings.” In *CD* VII 15 ff. the “king” of Amos 5:26–27 is reinterpreted as the “congregation,” and if the translator were aware of the special exegesis of the sect, it is hard to understand why he would move from the singular

“king” (MT) to the plural “kings” in 1:15. Dines (81–82) also mentions the possibility that the “kings,” “priests,” and “rulers” of 1:15 are the “priest-kings” of the Hasmonean dynasty (John Hyrcanus and Aristobulus), but she notes that this hypothesis does not accord well with the Ammonite context of 1:13–15.

Oracle against Moab, 2:1–3

This oracle, against the descendants of Moab, the brother nation of Ammon, is fairly straightforward with no major problems. The land of Moab is the area east of the southern half of the Dead Sea. Moab’s sin is against Idumea, their neighbor and adversary across the Brook Zered to the south, not against Israel or Judah. (See 1:11–12 on “Idumea.”) The international injustice described in this oracle is an act of furious vengeance and barbaric inhumanity; they burned the bones of the king of Idumea to “dust.” This word (κονία) could be translated “plaster” (Deut 27:2, 4) or “dust” (Job 28:4; 38:38; Isa 27:9); the most common idea of the word, especially when connected with fire, would be “dust” or “ashes” (LSJ, 977), but if the reader knew the context and background of the passage in the Hebrew Bible, they might understand it to mean “lime, plaster.” (See Garrett, 48–49 on the background and LSJ, 77 on the possible meanings of the word.)

The LXX emphasizes the involvement of all the people of Moab; they are guilty because “they” burned the bones of the king of Idumea. The “shouting” and “the sound of a trumpet” are typical descriptions of war or siege (1:14; Zeph 1:16). In 2:3 B underscores further the total annihilation of Moab with “I will kill all *the people* of her” (see text notes). Thus in the LXX the whole nation is guilty, and the destruction of all is emphasized; furthermore, they will be “helpless.” “Judge,” without the article or any modifier in 2:3 (following the Hebrew), would have probably been understood to be indefinite, although it is awkward.

B. 2:4–16

Oracle against Judah, 2:4–5

The capital *beta* at the beginning of this section in Vaticanus marks it as a new major division. This major division contains the oracles against Judah and Israel. The LXX translator makes two additions in the oracle against Judah that clarify the meaning. The addition of “the children of” before Judah makes it explicit that the oracle is referring to the people of Judah and is not

necessarily connected to the locale so designated (cf. 1:5). It also emphasizes that the people as a whole were guilty, not just the “fathers” mentioned later in the verse. Second, the addition of “which they made,” to modify τὰ μάταια αὐτῶν, leaves no doubt that the “vain things” are idols (see Lev 17:7; 4 Kgdms 17:15; Hos 5:11; and Jer 2:5 for other places where this language is used for idols; Stuart, 307). Theocharous (99) suggests that this verse echos 4 Kgdms 17:15–16 and perhaps Jer 2:5.

The cause of the Lord’s judgment of Judah is different than that of any of the other nations mentioned to this point; it involves disloyalty to the Lord. The verb “rejected” (ἀπωθέω) has the idea of “push away from oneself” in the middle voice (LSJ, 232). I have capitalized “Law,” because for the LXX translator and his readers νόμος commonly refers to the written and authoritative divine Law, especially in the Pentateuch (TDNT 4:1046–1047). The only other occurrence of νόμος in Amos is the free rendering in 4:5 where it has this common LXX sense. The rejection of the Law of the Lord entails the next two sins: not keeping the commands of the Lord and following after idols. There are several similarities between this passage and the description of Israel’s sins that led to their captivity in 5:25–27. Both passages specify the sin of idolatry and describe the idols as things that the people made (2:4; 5:26). Also both passages implicate earlier and later generations of the nation in the sins described. The sins of the fathers become paradigmatic to the children. Judah’s sin is not one specific act of disobedience but rather a long history of disloyalty to their covenant with the Lord. The idea of idols leading astray the people of Judah could have implications of idols having power. Of course, it means that the people of Judah were led astray by their idol worship.

The relative clause at the end of verse 4, “which things their fathers followed after,” is awkward because of the blending of Hebrew and Greek idioms here for the first time in this book (Dines, 83, n. 4). To avoid confusion I have not translated the pronoun at the end of verse 4 (αὐτῶν). It seems clear from the sense of the passage that the final pronoun refers to the idols they had made (“followed after [them]”). To include the final pronoun in the translation suggests that it is parallel to the identical previous pronoun (in “their fathers”), which refers to the people of Judah that are addressed in the passage. For example, Dines (83) translates the last phrase in 2:4, “that their fathers followed, after them,” which could give the confusing idea that the fathers followed the later generations of Judah in their idol worship.

On the image of Jerusalem burning to its foundations, see 4 Kgdms 25:9–10. That Judah went into captivity and Jerusalem was burned because of idol wor-

ship and not keeping the Law could have been relevant to readers of the LXX, who might have faced pressures to do the same things (see *Aristeas* 128–172).

Oracle against Israel, 2:6–16

This oracle was especially important for Amos' prophecy, since the prophet was specifically sent to Israel (7:15). It probably would not have had the surprising rhetorical effect in the LXX that it would have had in its original presentation to Israel, following an apparently complete number (seven) of oracles against Israel's neighbors and enemies. This oracle contains by far the most detailed list of charges of any of the oracles in chapters 1–2, and the list of accusations has nothing to do with military violence, as the first six, or idolatry, as with Judah. Instead this oracle contains a list of immoral and unethical actions that signify Israel's infidelity to the covenant and lead to its unavoidable punishment.

After the standard introduction in 2:6a, 2:6b–8 lists seven sins of Israel with καί (6 ×) connecting the various sins. The first sin, the selling of a righteous man for money, apparently involves selling him into slavery (see LSJ, 197, and Mur, 53, for this common meaning of ἀποδίδωμι in the middle voice). The description of the second sin at the end of 1:6 could be considered a parallel description of the first sin since there is no verb in this description, but the καί between the two descriptions is apparently functioning here as καί does everywhere else in verses 6–8, to separate the various sins. The second sin, selling a “poor man,” is worse than the first because it is only for a paltry sum, for “sandals.” (1 Kgdms 12:3 may be “a late echo of Amos' phrase” concerning sandals, Cripps, 140). With the first sin the price of the sale is described by the genitive of “price and value” (“for money,” Smyth, §1372; the second price [“for sandals”] is preceded and controlled by ἐνεκεν). The charges boil down to “lack of pity and contempt for human dignity” (Paul, 78). In 8:6 the oppressors desire to buy the lowly person “for sandals.”

The treatment of the poor and lowly is a major theme in Amos. Three nouns are used for these people: πένης (2:6; 4:1; 5:12; 8:4; 4 × of the 5 × it occurs in MP); πτωχός (2:7; 4:1; 5:11; 8:4 and 6; 5 × of the 6 × it occurs in MP); and ταπεινός (2:7; 8:6; 2 × of the 4 × it occurs in MP). These words “denote the economically weak as distinct from the wealthy” (TDNT, 6:39). They appear in Amos in four passages, and 2:6–7 is the first (see also 4:1; 5:11–12; and 8:4–6).

The first two Greek words used in Amos 2:6–7 to describe the poor (πένης and πτωχός) are often distinct in meaning in the LXX (TDNT, 6:39). Generally the “poor” person described in 2:6 (πένης) is not one who is destitute (that is πτωχός, used in 2:7, which is the normal word for the “poor” in the NT); πένης

is used for one who works for a living (BDAG, 795) and suggests a working class person, who for some reason is obliged to work to earn their keep. The πτωχός is often a beggar or someone so poor they literally have nothing. In the LXX one can enrich oneself by oppressing the πένης (Prov 22:16), and Sir 34:20 warns about bringing an offering from the property of the πένης; thus, they cannot be destitute or beggars (TDNT, 6:38–40). In 2:6–7 it appears as if the πένης, who at least can be sold for a pair of sandals, is more valuable than the πτωχός. In Amos 4:1; 5:11–12; and 8:4 these two words seem to be near synonyms. Note the discussion in 5:11 where according to some readings the πτωχός has possessions and is able to provide “choice gifts.” See also the discussion of ταπεινός in 2:7.

The translator of Amos seems to use the three somewhat interchangeable words for the poor and oppressed in an order of descending poverty and oppression in 2:6–7, where he moves from δίκαιος to πένης to πτωχός to ταπεινός. The same downward progression also seems to hold in 8:4–6 (πένης to πτωχός [2×] to ταπεινός).

The noun “righteous man” in 2:6 (δίκαιος) is another word that occurs with the three words for the poor and oppressed in Amos; the only two times it is used in Amos (2:6 and 5:12) are in contexts of oppression where the righteous are being oppressed with the poor and lowly. In the NT poverty can refer to an inner spiritual dimension of trust in God in afflictions (normally πτωχός as in Luke 6:20).

The occurrence of all four Greek terms in 2:6–7, each with in the description of a different sin of Israel, ties together the first four sins of Israel in this passage. The text starts with the highest level of the oppressed in 2:6, “the righteous one,” and then progresses down the scale to the “poor,” “destitute,” and then the “lowly.” Although the four terms do not occur together in the other three contexts where these nouns are used in Amos, this same order is found in 4:1 and 8:4–6 (as mentioned above); in 5:11–12 there is a slight variation, with “the righteous” placed second after the “poor.”

The treatment of the poor and oppressed would have been a relevant topic to early readers of the LXX. *Aristeas* (12–27) refers to the release of over 100,000 Jewish slaves by Philadelphus before he sends a request to the High Priest for a copy of the Law and translators. These slaves are given a gift of money as reimbursement for their slavery. Ben Sira (ca. 180) utters polemic against social injustice on the eve of the Hellenistic reform that led to the Maccabean revolt (e.g., Sir 34:20–22). However, Ben Sira does not praise the poor man; he praises the just rich man. There is no “direct praise [although there is sympathy] of the poor or of poverty in Jewish literature: it is first to be found in the gospel (Luke 6:20)” (Hengel, *Property and Riches*,

17). During the entire period of Greek and Roman domination the Jews in Palestine faced a great burden from taxation (Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1:27–29, 50). Hengel summarizes that “the Jewish struggles for freedom—first of all that of the Maccabees against the Macedonian Seleucids and then later that of the ‘Zealots’ against the Romans—were always also social struggles” (Hengel, *Property and Riches*, 16). One way to progress on the social scale and make money during the period of Ptolemaic and Seleucid domination was to become a part of the Hellenistic infrastructure or world. This was not possible for the peasant or small farmer in Judea, but it was a possibility for many Jews in metropolitan and cosmopolitan areas. As is evidenced by the LXX and the Alexandrian literature, many Jews in Egypt adopted Hellenism, while still attempting to maintain the particularities of Judaism (see the discussion in Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1:18–57). In Palestine interest in Hellenistic civilization was predominantly limited to the well to do in Jerusalem, and the common populace was primarily an object of exploitation. They were noticed only to make sure that their economic productivity was not limited (Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1:48, 56). Thus, the references to the poor and oppressed would have been very relevant to many readers of the LXX (note the change in the LXX of Isa 58:6, discussed in Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1:51–52). They would have found hope and comfort in many of these passages that they could not find in Hellenistic culture, which “originally recognized only responsibility to the family and the polis, and not to their poverty-stricken fellow men” (Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1:48).

The neuter plural attributive participle (τὰ πατοῦντα) at the beginning of 2:7 is “grammatically loose” (Dines, 85) but must refer back to the “sandals” (neut., pl., gen.) at the end of verse 6, the nearest antecedent. The Lucianic version attempted to improve this “grammatically loose” translation by changing it to the genitive case, producing a more logical connection with the genitive, “sandals” (Dines, 85). In the LXX the participial phrase at the beginning of 2:7 is a further description of the selling of the poor described in 2:6 (not an additional sin as in the MT). The clause “and they were striking [καὶ ἐκονδύλιζον] at the heads of the needy” is a new charge (see Mal 3:5 for the only other use of this verb in the LXX).

The fourth sin of Israel (1:7b) could have as many as four different interpretations. I have rendered it, “and they perverted the way of the lowly.” The verb, ἐκκλίνω, can be transitive (“bend, avoid, turn aside, turn off”) or intransitive (“to turn away, retire”). The verb has ὁδός as its object. The “lowly” (ταπεινός) are those who are low in social status (not humble in attitude or despondent, Mur, 547; see Amos 8:6) and thus vulnerable to the designs of the

rich and powerful (see the discussion of the various terms for the “poor” in 2:6). In Amos they seem to be the lowest category of the poor and oppressed in society.

Dines (86–87) suggests that ἐκκλίνω could have at least three different translations in 2:7b: (1) “to deny justice to,” (2) “to ignore or reject,” and (3) “to cause to turn aside.” First, it could mean “they turn away [pervert] the path [to justice] of the lowly,” i.e., to pervert justice or deny justice (Mur, 163). Normally with this sense the verb has “judgment” or a similar term as its object (Deut 16:19; 27:19), although in the similar context of Prov 17:23 the verb has ὁδός as its object (“an ungodly man perverts the ways of righteousness”). This understanding of the verb is similar to Muraoka’s interpretation of it in 5:12, “to wrong, do injustice to,” except that context has an accusative of person. The strength of this translation is its compatibility with the sin described in 2:6 and its similarity to the use of the same verb in 5:12.

Second, the verb could mean “avoid” in the sense of ignore, i.e., “they avoided the path of the lowly” (see Prov 5:12; Sir 32:17, which speak of “shunning” or “avoiding” reproof); however, one would expect the object to be plural (“ways” or “paths”) if this is the meaning, and this sense is inconsistent with the actions described in 2:6 where they buffet the heads of the lowly. Furthermore, this charge seems to be too weak in light of the other sins listed. In a related understanding, the verb could have the sense of “turn away from” in the sense of reject, which is related to the previous meaning, but differs from it because of a different understanding of the “way” and the “humble” (“they turned away from [i.e., rejected] the manner of life of the pious”; see Gen 38:16 for this sense of the verb with a literal use of “way”). The singular “way” supports this understanding of the clause, and the idea of the humble as the godly or pious is common in the LXX (Mur, 547).

Third, the verb could have the causative sense, “to make to turn aside.” This could be physical (2 Kgdms 3:27) or more likely here, moral (e.g., have a bad influence on or corrupt; 3 Kgdms 11:2, 3; Sir 8:2; Ps 140:4). This last possibility finds support in the hint at sacrilegious behavior in verse 8 (Dines, 88).

It is interesting that sometimes the Fathers interpret this clause to have the idea of social rejection or ostracism (Theodore, 257B; Cyril, 441B–D; Jerome, 1.122; see Dines, 87), which is a common meaning of this word in non-biblical literature (LSJ, 509; BDAG, 304). Dines (87) suggests that the variety of exegesis of this clause evidenced in the Fathers “demonstrates how, once the Greek text was studied apart from the Hebrew, ideas from non-biblical word-usage could come quite forcibly into play.” However, the context seems to require something serious, and neither social ostracism nor rejecting a lifestyle of humility seems serious enough for this context.

The trouble with the first proposed meaning (“deny justice to”) is that for the most part this meaning must be read into the text. Therefore, the last suggested meaning, the causative sense, “to cause to turn aside (morally),” or “pervert,” is the simplest and most likely meaning in this context.

The fifth sin of Israel in the LXX (2:7c, a father and son having sexual relations with the same woman) is nowhere explicitly mentioned in the legal sections of the Bible (Paul, 81; Wolff, 167). Lev 18:17 states the basic moral principle involved: the prohibition of close relatives having sexual relations with the same person. The word employed to describe the woman (παῖδισκη) is always used in the LXX and related literature to refer to a “slave girl” (BDAG, 750; see also LEH, 347; Mur, 429). This understanding of the word is supported by patristic exegesis of this passage (Dines, 88). Mur (429) describes its meaning in the LXX as a “female counterpart of παῖς ... ranked higher than δοῦλος and δούλη and ... lower in rank than family members.” LSJ observes that the word “properly refers to *age*, not to *condition*.” However, in nonbiblical literature it often refers to a “prostitute” (LSJ, 1287; see Herodotus, *Hist.* 1.93; Plutarch, *Per.* 24). Therefore, it is possible that it refers to a prostitute or to cultic prostitution here, although this would be the only time it is so used in the LXX. The word suggests that the sin involved may not be simply sexual immorality, but also sexual exploitation of the weak and vulnerable.

The verb εἰσπορεύομαι in this context is a euphemism for sexual relations; it does not refer specifically to the sex act, but rather to the entering into the presence of the woman, here, as often, for the purpose of sex (Mur, 154). It is not the normal word for “entering in” to a woman for sexual relations in the LXX; that is εἰσέρχομαι, which occurs about four times as often in the LXX as εἰσπορεύομαι, and is also much more common in classical Greek. In the three other passages in which εἰσπορεύομαι is used as a euphemism for sexual relations in the LXX (5× in 3 verses) it is in an immoral or unusual situation: (1) the sons of God entering in to the daughters of men, Gen 6:4 (note that 1 Enoch 7:1 also uses εἰσπορεύομαι); (2) the men who have adulterous relations with Oholah and Oholibah, Ezek 23:44 (3×); and (3) the first seven husbands of Sarah, all of whom die on their wedding night when they go in to her, Tob 7:11. The use of εἰσπορεύομαι in these infamous and unusual sexual encounters suggests such sexual relationships were being described in Amos 2:7.

The imperfect tense in this clause indicates a pattern of activity (see also 2:12). The subordinate clause that modifies the description of the sin (“so that they profane the name of their god”) designates either the purpose or the result of this sin. The verb form in Vaticanus is difficult (see text notes), and it is apparently some form of the subjunctive. The context requires that

this be a result clause (“so that they profane the name of their god,” see Mur 410). This would not be the purpose or intention of such action. Note the reference to “their god” again at the end of 2:8; this phrase is ambiguous and suggests that they do not worship the God of Israel.

The verb translated “profane” in 2:7 (βεβηλόω) “speaks of a sort of sacrilege” (Spicq, 1:284). It means, “to cause something highly revered to become identified with the commonplace” (BDAG, 173). Spicq (1:284) notes that the related adjective (βεβηλός) “is used for places that are not consecrated, where it is permitted to set foot; hence, accessible to everybody (cf. Philo, *Alleg. Interp.* 1.62; Josephus, *A.J.* 3.181; *B.J.* 4.182; Thucydides, 4.97.3).” He goes on to explain that when the word takes on a technical meaning “the profane is opposed to the sacred as the impure is to the pure” (284). This fifth sin is outrageous, and such actions result in sacrilege and the god of the perpetrators being brought down to the level of the common and profane.

An important word in the description of the sixth sin of the Israelites in 2:8a is the noun παραπέτασμα. It is a *hapax* in biblical Greek and more common in nonbiblical Greek; the related καταπέτασμα is used in the LXX and NT, usually referring to the curtains in the Tent of Meeting or the veil of the Temple, but it is not common in nonbiblical Greek (see Dines, 91–100 for an extended discussion of these terms). In nonbiblical Greek παραπέτασμα refers to “that which is spread before a thing, a hanging curtain” (LSJ, 1320). The two words are near synonyms, as is seen in the use of παραπέτασμα by Aquila (Ex 37:3 [MT 36:35]) and Symmachus (Num 4:26) in their versions of the LXX and in the ornate nature of the curtains both words describe (see for example Josephus, *B.J.* 5.212 on καταπέτασμα and Herodotus, *Hist.* 9.82 on παραπέτασμα).

In Amos 2:8 the translator uses παραπέτασμα to describe “garments” bound together “with cords.” Dines suggests that three passages might provide some background for the phrase here: Isa 54:2; 2 Kgdms 16:22; Ezek 16:16. The last, which could be translated by the same translator who translated LXX-Amos (Dines, *The Septuagint*, 23), is the most likely. Ezek 16:16 states “And you took some of your clothes, and you made for yourself sewn together images, and you fornicated upon them.” The general context of Ezek 16, the sewing together of images or idols from garments, as well as the presence together of ἱμάτιον and ποιέω suggest that the translator may have had in mind sins similar to Amos 2:8a. (See also 4 Kgdms 23:7.) It is interesting that the translator seems to be influenced by a description of the sins of Jerusalem (Ezek 16) in his rendition of the sins of Israel in Amos; it appears that he reads the descriptions of Israel in Amos through descriptions of Jerusalem and Judah found elsewhere.

In summary, the description of this sin taking place “near the altar” suggests that it is committed in the temple in Jerusalem or in an alternative temple like the one at Leontopolis in Egypt. The garments of the oppressors or sinners are used to make curtains, which either have idolatrous connections (Ezek 16:16) or are used to conceal sinful activity like that described at the end of 2:7. It is possible that the “garments” in this verse are the garments of the priests. (1Macc 3:49 uses ἱμάτιον for the priestly attire.) In that case the translator could be referring again to a Hellenized Jerusalem priesthood, as was also suggested in 1:15 (Dines, 100).

The seventh and final sin of Israel in 2:8b involves the oppressors indulging their appetites with wine they have gained by “extortion” (Mur, 529). Paul suggests that ἐκ συκοφαντιῶν has the idea “to extort by false information” (86). They were using monies corruptly gained to finance their indulgences and drinking bouts. “In the house of their god” seems to leave open the possibility of various and false gods (see also “their god” in 2:7b). Thus, the oracle of judgment against Israel concludes with another example of the selfish indulgence and religious insensitivity of powerful oppressors who exploit the lowly.

In Vaticanus Amos 2:6–16 is all one unit; however, even though it is all one unit, there is a new development, marked by “but I” (ἐγὼ δέ), at the beginning of 2:9, indicating a new subject. Verses 9–11 enumerate some of God’s blessings and benefits for Israel; verse 12 contains further examples of Israel’s rebellion and lack of response to him; and verses 13–16 detail the judgment and calamity that they will experience. First, God reminds Israel that they owe their existence as a nation and the possession of Canaan to him (2:9–10). Without his help they never could have defeated the mighty “Amorrites” (2:9 and 10, which is apparently a name for the combined inhabitants of Canaan during the time of the conquest). There is some question about the second main verb in verse 9 (see text notes). However, the point of the section is clear: God has been faithful to his covenant people Israel; he destroyed the inhabitants of Canaan before them and led them from Egypt through the wilderness for forty years to inherit the land of the Canaanites (2:9–10). “Forty years” here clearly refers to Israel’s desert experience coming out of Egypt; the historical background is not as obvious in the other reference to “forty years” in Amos (5:25).

God also provided spiritual leaders for Israel (2:11); he “chose [them] from among [you].” The phrase “and from among your young men for consecration” is obscure, but 2:12 helps make a connection with “Nazirites” (MT); in this context it is unlikely they would understand “consecration” (ἀγιασμός) as an “offering to the dead” (LSJ, 9).

The question in 2:11b (“are not these things so?”) is an unusual construction (μή οὐκ ἔστιν ταῦτα). This order of the two negatives occurs only about ten times in the LXX, and in six of those occurrences it is used in a rhetorical question, expecting a positive answer, as here (Judg 14:3; 3 Kgdms 6:3; Eccl 6:6; Isa 50:2; 59:1). Although it is unusual (see Smyth, 626, for the use of μή οὐ with the indicative), the Greek reader probably would have had little trouble understanding the sense of this construction.

Verse 12 describes further sins of the Israelites (cf. 2:6–8). Their sins are in stark contrast to the Lord’s goodness described in 2:9–11, and this contrast is emphasized by the switch to the second person plural verb in 2:12 and by the use of the imperfect tense, suggesting an ongoing practice of defiling the “consecrated ones” and silencing “the prophets.” The emphatic prohibition at the end of verse 12, “Do not ever prophesy,” is the first of 22 instances of this double negative (οὐ μή) in Amos, almost always with a subjunctive verb. Vaticanus has the future (σώσει) in 2:14 and 15; this could be due to itacism. (See Smyth, §1800, 2755; BDAG, 517, III, D on οὐ μή with the subjunctive. BDF §365 regards the aorist and future as virtually interchangeable when used with οὐ μή to designate “negation regarding the future.” See also MHT, I, 187–192.) The translator has a tendency to emphasize negation in Amos with a double negative when a single negative particle would suffice. That the double negative is emphatic is clear in several passages in Amos (8:14; 9:10, 15).

According to 2:9–12 the Lord provided for Israel and gave them everything they needed to obey him, but they defiled those sanctified to him and silenced his prophets. They are without excuse. Διὰ τοῦτο at the beginning of verse 13 clarifies the relationship between the sins in 2:12 and the resulting judgment in 2:13–16; because the Lord has made Israel his people and by his power made them into the nation that they are (2:9–11; cf. 3:2), and because they have habitually sinned and rejected his words and ministry to them through the religious leaders he gave to them (2:12), “therefore” (διὰ τοῦτο) he is going to judge them.

The first description of judgment in 2:13 makes little sense. The description of God “rolling under” the Israelites “like a wagon” is confusing at best. Based on the context the reader of the LXX probably would have understood something like, “I will press you down, like a wagon full of sheaves presses down” (similar to MT).

The message of 2:14–15 comes through clearly in the LXX; no one, no matter how swift, skilled, or strong, will escape the judgment decreed on Israel. The emphatic οὐ μή with the subjunctive or future (5 × in these verses) emphasizes this fact. Many terms in these verses suggest a battle or military

context (φυγή, μαχητής, τοξότης, and ιππεύς), and one receives the impression that the judgment prophesied will come through a foreign army.

The critical texts of Ziegler and Rahlfs begin 2:16 with the clause, “and he will find his confidence,” which does not make sense in this context. Vaticanus has ὁ κραταιὸς οὐ μὴ εὕρῃσει, resulting in the smoother translation, “the strong man will never find his confidence.” Several obscure words add to the difficulty of this verse. Καρδία (in “the strong man will find ‘heart’”) is best understood as “confidence” in 2:16 (Mur, 289), and the phrase ἐν δυναστείαις could be a reference to “power, mighty deeds” (LEH, 122), “a powerful army” (Mur, 136), or perhaps even “oppressive regimes,” following the prevalent political use of the term in non-biblical Greek (Dines, 103, n. 28). I have understood this plural form to refer to “a powerful army,” since the context is filled with references to military strength. Dines suggests “oppressive regimes,” as a possible *double entendre*, in connection with the possibility that ὁ γυμνός may be a further veiled allusion to Hellenizers (103).

The whole clause, ὁ γυμνός διώξεται, is difficult. The middle future form διώξεται is apparently active in meaning, as is common in the Twelve (Hos 6:3; Amos 6:12; Nah 1:8). BDF, § 77, notes that only the active form appears in the NT. In this intransitive construction it probably means “run” (Amos 6:12; Hab 2:2; Hag 1:9), apparently in the sense of “move away with speed,” thus “flee” (Mur, 131). In that case “the naked man” is another example of those who will not be able to stand in the coming judgment. The article modifying “naked” is the seventh article designating a specific category of those who will be judged by God in 2:14–16 (though there is no connector [καί] distinguishing the last group). This last group of those who will be judged brings to mind Jews like those described in 1 Macc 1:14–15 and 2 Macc 4:9–15, who enrolled in the gymnasium and went over to the Greek way of life; they were part of the cause of the Maccabean revolt and reaction to Hellenism. Foremost among this group was a number of priests (2 Macc 4:9–15).

Once again the prophecy of judgment (2:13–16) can be applied to situations in the time of the translator. The accumulation of such possible applications in the LXX supports the thesis that a second or first century BCE reader of it would make such connections.

Γ. 3:1–5:15

The Inseparability of Covenant-Breaking and Punishment, 3:1–8

In 3:1–2 the Lord announces that because of his special relationship with them he must judge his people, the house of Israel, for their sin. Verses 3–8 contain

a series of rhetorical questions that emphasize the necessary connection between sin and the Lord's judgment (3:3–6) and between what the Lord does and the proclamation of the prophets (3:7–8).

In 3:1 Israel is addressed as a “house” and a “tribe.” The καί in the second half of 3:1 serves as a “syntactic link” (Park, 144), clarifying that there are two different recipients of the judgment in this verse, “Israel” and “every tribe which I brought up out of the land of Egypt.” The prepositional phrase κατὰ πάσης φυλῆς following καί is difficult in the sense it could be read as a distributive use of the adjective πᾶς, i.e., “every tribe” (Dines, 104), since there is no article modifying the related noun, or it could be a collective understanding of the adjective πᾶς, “all the tribe” (Brenton, NETS, MT). “In classical Greek the rule for πᾶς in the singular is that with the article it is collective, without the article it is distributive” (C & S, § 63; see also Smyth, § 1174). Although as the object of a preposition the noun φυλῆς could be definite (Smyth § 1128; BDF § 255), the use of it in 1:5 and 8 argues against such an understanding here, and this should probably be read as a distributive use of πᾶς. Whichever way one understands the adjective, the intended recipients of “this word” include more than the Northern Kingdom of “Israel.” This passage refers to all of “Israel,” including Judah; the Lord did not lead any other nations out of Egypt (9:7).

Πλὴν at the beginning of verse 2 functions as a conjunction rather than a preposition (with a gen. object), and it is best understood to mean “only,” rather than “especially” (see 9:8; Mur, 463; cf. Brenton). Symmachus revises it to μόνους. In contrast to the distributive reading “every tribe” in 3:1, the two uses of πᾶς in 3:2 are collective; both are plural. Note also the three plural references to “you” in 3:2; i.e., “Only you [pl.] have I known out of all the tribes of the earth.” The Targum reads “In you alone have I taken pleasure” (3:2), apparently not wanting to limit God's knowledge; perhaps the LXX translator understood that God's knowledge, described in 3:2, refers to his love and election of his people (Mur, 99). This special love that the Lord has for his people is the reason (διὰ τοῦτο) he will punish them for their sins. The verb ἐκδικέω translated “bring punishment upon” (Mur, 160), can have the sense of “avenge” or “take revenge,” but that sense is not appropriate here (cf. 3:14).

The emphasis of 3:3–6 is that sin and punishment are inseparable. The Lord is the one responsible for the punishment that has come on the nations. Each of the seven rhetorical questions in 3:3–6 is introduced by the conditional particle εἰ. The particle εἰ is often used to introduce direct questions in biblical Greek (C & S, § 100; Mur, 145; BDAG, 278). All the questions expect a negative answer, although the point of the first six is to lead up to the seventh question in 3:6b, which is the most important one. In this regard they develop much

like the judgment oracles in 1:2–2:16. Although there may be a cause-and-effect relationship between the two elements in some of the questions (e.g., 3:6), what unites all seven questions is the connection or association between two elements; each question contains two things that are inseparable. Thus, the point of the passage is that the Lord's judgment is a consistent response to sin and the two are inseparably connected.

The subject of the first question is travelers. The verb *πορεύομαι* speaks of setting out on a journey (Mur, 474). The reciprocal pronoun *ἑαυτούς*, used here as a reflexive (BDF, § 287, 283; BDAG, 269), underscores the idea of a mutual relationship. On *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό* ("together"), see 1:5. The addition of the adverb *καθόλου* (also in 3:4), meaning "at all" or "ever," emphasizes the proverbial or general nature of the truth that two people set out on a journey together as a result of knowing each other.

The rhetorical questions in 3:4 relate to animals, more specifically lions. The questions are similar and emphasize that lions roar or make noise when they have taken prey. The first verb, *ἐρεύγομαι*, gives an image of forceful utterance (BDAG, 391; cf. 3:8). On the construction "give voice" in 2:4b, see 1:2, where this language refers to the Lord. *Καθόλου* in 3:3 may have triggered the addition of it in 3:4b (Arieti, 41 and Park, 147 classify it as an addition; Tov, *Parallel Texts*, does not call it an addition).

The two questions in 3:5 concern bird hunting. The first question entails that a bird does not fall to the ground for no reason; if a bird falls, it is because of a hunter. Verse 5b continues the theme: a trap is not "released" (Mur, 544; LSJ, 1743; the verb is *σχάζω*) or "triggered" (Dines, 105) unless it catches something.

The final two questions in 3:6 concern events in cities. The logic of the first question is based on the alarm in a city when the trumpet warns of an enemy's approach (see also Hos 5:8). The verb, "be terrified" (*πτοέω*), suggests greater alarm and terror than *φοβέω* in 3:8a. The second question in this verse, and the last of the seven in 3:3–6, is the point of these verses. It explicitly brings God into the discussion and asks if disaster can happen in a city outside of God's control. There are theological problems inherent in the wording, especially the understanding of the word *κακία*. This word is the normal word for "evil," but in this context the sense seems to be "trouble," "distressing circumstances," or "misfortune" (BDAG, 500; Dines, 105). The ambiguous translation in the LXX avoids the possibility that God is directly responsible for evil (cf. MT and the Targum's rendering, "Or can misfortune come to a city unless it was done from before the Lord?"). In the LXX the feminine relative pronoun, *ἣν*, could refer to either the "evil" or the "city." Thus, the verse could speak of "evil in the city, which [evil] the Lord has not caused" or "evil in the

city which [city] the Lord did not make” (Satterthwaite, 17). The reference to “evil” is extraneous in the latter interpretation of the verse; its point is that the Lord made all cities, and by implication all things, and that understanding of the verse certainly alleviates the theological problems some might see in the former interpretation. I have tried to reflect the ambiguity of the text in my translation. The purpose of the question is to emphasize that the Lord controls all things.

Verses 7–8 go beyond the connection of sin and punishment in verses 3–6 to the connection of the actions of the Lord and the prophetic explanation of those actions; the Lord has sent disaster as punishment for sins (3:3–6), and he has revealed it to the prophets and Amos (3:7), and Amos must proclaim it (3:8). Although most would probably understand the force of *διότι* in 3:7 to be causal (Dines, 105–106 “because”; Arieti, 42–43 “since”; Brenton “for”), the logic of the passage requires the conjunction to be inferential here (“therefore”). The relationship between the Lord’s revelation to his prophets and his actions (3:7–8) is not the cause of the previous connections between sin and punishment in 3:3–6, but rather the inference that the author makes from the previous rhetorical questions. They all illustrate the point of 3:7; there is a necessary connection between the prophets’ words of “instruction” and the acts of the Lord. What the prophets say comes from the Lord and interprets his actions. This usage of *διότι* is found elsewhere in the LXX and the NT; see Isa 3:8 and Hos 8:6 (Mur, 129; LEH, 1:117; cf. also BDAG, 251). Another important word in 3:7 is the noun *παίδεία*, “instruction.” According to Seeligmann, “Hellenistic Jewry may have had an inclination to represent prophesying as teaching: *παίδεία*” (*Isaiah*, 109; see also Isa 50:4–5); thus, the Lord reveals himself and his message through teaching, and the prophecy through which the Lord speaks includes and is especially related to teaching and instruction. This would give authority to the translator’s work and the work of other teachers in his era, and it suggests he was a scholar-scribe. It also gives authority to contemporary teaching and teachers, putting them on the level of the prophets. Certainly this word would resonate well with a Greek audience. (See the textual note concerning the pronoun [“his”] modifying “instruction.”)

The two questions in 3:8 provide the conclusion and main point of this section in the LXX (3:1–8). Each question in 3:8 connects two inseparable elements, as in each statement in 3:3–7; however, in 3:8 the translator smoothes the connection between the elements with *καί* between the two clauses in each question (see Park, 144–145; he calls this *καί* a “syntactic link”). The logic of the verse is airtight; as the roaring of a lion brings fear, so when the Lord speaks his prophet must prophesy, as Jonah had to learn. The logic also suggests that people best pay attention to what the Lord is

saying through his prophets. (The Targum renders the last clause, “who will not hear the prophecy?”) It is likely that the roaring of the lion that causes fear would remind the reader of the Lord speaking (see 1:2; cf. 3:4). If so, the future tense suggests the Lord is still going to speak (3:8a). However, the Lord’s speaking that leads to prophecy is past (“The Lord has spoken,” 3:8b). Dines (106, n. 2) notes the difficulty of understanding the tenses and the time of 3:1–8, and especially 3:7–8. Whether the reader would think of the Lord speaking and prophetic activity in the past or in the present or future is difficult to know. However, the future tenses (esp. in 3:7–8, 3×) and the description of the Lord’s revelation to the prophets as *παιδεία* in 3:7, which is perhaps the contemporary application of what “The Lord has spoken” (3:8a) through the biblical prophets, point to the fact that prophecy is relevant to the readers. The force of the passage for readers would be that they should listen to the prophets of the Lord, especially as recorded in Scripture and applied to them in relevant *παιδεία* by the teachers and scribes of their times. I should also note that in 3:7 and 8 the title for God, κύριος ὁ θεός, has the sense of “the Lord who is God.”

Witnesses of Israel’s Oppression and the Plundering of Tyre, 3:9–11

This passage is difficult to understand. The text calls the “Assyrians” and Egyptians to assemble to observe Samaria’s sin and judgment (so Dines, 106; Park, 168). This would make sense with the readers’ *post eventum* knowledge as to the historical conquerors of the Northern Kingdom (Dines, 106; see also Park, 168). Χώρα (“place, land, district, country”) is a favorite word in Amos (3:9 [2×], 10, 11; 6:8; 5 of the 7× it is found in the MP). This word indicates the proclamation in 3:9 is not simply to Assyria and Egypt, but rather to specific localities or districts within them. Compare the reference to “Damascus” in 3:12.

The text of 3:9 contains two commands, apparently addressed to the recipients, to “proclaim” and “say” to localities within Assyria and Egypt, who themselves were callous oppressors of helpless people. People from these localities are to assemble on the mountain of Samaria to bear witness to the oppressions in Samaria, as well as the “marvelous things in the midst of her.” The word translated “marvelous things” (θαυμαστά), in the neuter plural, as here, normally refers to the works of God on behalf of his people, for which he deserves praise (Exod 34:10; Josh 3:5; Tob 12:22; Sir 11:4). However, in the prophets the substantival use of this word has a different emphasis; it still refers to the works of God, but it refers to his judgment, sometimes in an eschatological context (Isa 25:1; Dan 12:6; Mic 7:15; in Isa 3:3 it functions as an adjective). Mur (256) notes that the word has a negative connotation in Amos

3:9. In Dan Th 8:24 the neuter plural form of the word functions as an adverb modifying the destruction of Antiochus IV (“and he will destroy wonderfully” or if it is functioning as a substantive, “he will destroy marvelous things”). In this context Daniel receives a vision of Antiochus’ destructive power and military successes, and Antiochus destroys “mighty men and the holy people.” Thus, the use of this word elsewhere in the prophets suggests that in Amos 3:9 the Assyrians and the Egyptians are being summoned to view the marvelous judgments that the Lord has decreed for Samaria, perhaps at the hand of Antiochus (Dan 8:20–26; cf. 12:6), and the oppressions that are in her, which are the cause of those judgments.

The third person singular verb (“she did not know”) at the beginning of 3:10 agrees in number with “in her” (ἐν αὐτῇ) at the end of 3:9 and must refer to Samaria. Brenton translates 3:10a, “And she knew not what things would come against her,” apparently taking ἔσται in the sense of “come.” His translation “come” from the future of εἰμί does not follow. One of the verbs εἰμί can be translated “will come” or “will go,” but that verb has no future stem, and it is the present tense of that verb that is so translated (Smyth, § 773–776; cf. Mur, 147, which lists the meaning “emerge, make appearance” for εἰμί). The form here is the future of εἰμί. His rendering of ἐναντίον as “against” is possible, but unlikely (Mur, 183). On the phrase “what things are before her,” see Glenny, 128.

The major problem in 3:10b is the antecedent of the articular participle, “those who are storing up.” Does it refer to “her,” i.e., Samaria, or to “the Assyrians” and “Egypt,” who are called to witness the events in Samaria? The masculine plural article is most naturally connected with the Assyrians and Egypt, who are addressed in 3:9 (“Assyrians” in the plural) and are likely referred to again in 3:10a by the collective neuter plural relative pronoun [ὅ] “what things.” In 3:9–10 Samaria is always third person feminine singular. Also, the repetition of χῶρα connects the “unrighteousness and misery in their districts [χῶρα]” in 3:10b with the references to the “districts [χῶρα] among the Assyrians and ... the districts [χῶρα] of Egypt” in 3:9. Verse 11 suggests that Tyre could also be included with Assyria and Egypt as one of those “storing up unrighteousness and misery” (χῶρα is repeated in 3:11, referring to Tyre also). Thus, in the LXX it is Assyria, Egypt, and possibly Tyre, that are “storing up unrighteousness and misery in their districts.” This understanding of 3:10 means that the things Samaria did not know would be in her presence (or be against her) were Assyria and Egypt. The verse describes Samaria’s ignorance that her evil enemies had been called by the Lord to witness her sins and to judge her (cf. 3:12).

“Therefore” (διὰ τοῦτο) at the beginning of 3:11 introduces what follows from the preceding; apparently it is the result of the nations “storing up

unrighteousness and misery” (3:10b). On the introductory formula, τὰδε λέγει κύριος, see the discussion in 1:3. This formula, which is found in the oracles of judgment in chapters 1–2 occurs six other times in Amos (3:11, 12; 5:3, 4, 16; 7:17) and is common in the prophets, especially Jeremiah (over 60 ×) and Ezekiel (ca. 125 ×). On Tyre and possible factors that caused tension between it and Jerusalem and Jews in the second century BCE, see 1:9–10. It is possible that the translator and readers of the LXX would have connected 3:11 with the destruction of Tyre by Alexander, one of the most famous examples of destruction of that time.

But is the translator referring to the land of Syria around Tyre or the land of Israel with ἡ γῆ σου (“your land”)? If “your land” would be the land of Israel, then the noun “Tyre” (Τύρος) would be the object of κυκλόθεν, which would be functioning as a preposition (“from around Tyre your land [Israel] will be made desolate”). In that case “Tyre” should be in the genitive. However, “Tyre” (Τύρος) must be a vocative, and κυκλόθεν an adverb; thus “your land” refers to the Syrian territory surrounding “Tyre,” which “will be made desolate.” (The patristic commentators have both interpretations and are therefore little help, Dines, 108–109.)

In the next clause there is no clear antecedent for the subject of the verb κατάρξει (“and he will bring down from you your strength”); a general subject of the verb is apparently to be understood (“he,” “it,” “one”), referring to one of the nations or all of them. If it were referring to the Lord it would be “I,” as Cyril has it, since the Lord is speaking. Thus, 3:11 is addressed to Tyre and announces its overthrow and desolation because it has a part in the sins described in 3:10b.

Violent Destruction of Israelites in Samaria and Damascus, 3:12

In 3:12 the destruction of “the sons of Israel” is compared to the devouring of a lamb by a lion, with only scraps remaining. The destruction is prophesied for the “sons of Israel” not only “in Samaria,” but also “in Damascus.” The most difficult problem in the verse is the meaning of κατέναντι τῆς φυλῆς, which I have translated “before the tribe.” The meaning of the preposition is worthy of comment, and the referent of the noun is obscure. The preposition occurs five times in the Twelve, and means “against” (Mic 2:8) and “before” or “in the presence of” (Amos 4:3; Joel 1:16; Zech 14:4). The latter idea, which is the common translation of this preposition, is required here.

J.F.A. Sawyer (“Those Priests in Damascus”) argues that the noun φυλῆς should be understood as definite, which is not an issue in B, where the article is present. He goes on to argue, surely correctly, that “from the LXX point

of view, ‘the Tribe’ par excellence was the tribe of Judah” (124). Although the singular noun φυλή occurs seldom in the LXX without a proper name attached, there is support in the LXX for Sawyer’s conclusion (Mic 6:9, where it is parallel to the city of Jerusalem; Ezek 21:13 [or 21:18, depending on the verse numbering], where it refers to the people of Israel, which to Ezekiel and the reader means Judah; and Ruth 3:11, where it clearly refers to Judah). The reader of the LXX would probably understand the phrase “before the tribe” to be modifying the immediately preceding “the sons of Israel who are dwelling in Samaria,” and if the prepositional phrase refers to “the tribe” of Judah, it would mean that the devastation of Samaria takes place before Judah or as Judah, Israel’s neighbor, watches. This could be a reference to 722 BCE. Brenton understands the phrase in 3:12 as “in the presence of a *foreign* tribe.” This is an interesting idea that would perhaps suggest Seleucids.

Sawyer also makes a good case for polemic in 3:12. He concludes that “the verse ... makes good sense against a background of religious rivalry at an early stage in the history of the LXX” (128). He builds his case on the claim that until Christianity emerged the LXX was the major organ of the “official Jewish viewpoint on all religious matters, including presumably the activities of rival sects” (126). He is no doubt correct that there were rival sects during the time that the LXX was being translated, that groups like the Essenes were found in Egypt, and that what happened in Jerusalem would have been a major concern in Egypt (Harl, Dorival, Munnich, 37, 70). He is also certainly correct that during this time texts of Scripture were often reinterpreted to fit contemporary issues (e.g., CD VII on Amos 5:26). However, Dines rightly questions his use of terms like “orthodox,” “official,” and “sectarian” for this period. She claims, “Late second century Judaism appears to be too complex a phenomenon to speak as yet of any ‘official’ voice” (116). Therefore, it is likely that “the sons of Israel in Samaria ... and in Damascus”, who are the objects of God’s judgment in 3:12, are some “Samaritan rivals” or “Qumran-like sectaries” towards whom the translator had strong animosity (Dines, 117). However, it is impossible for us clearly to identify such a specific group, and it is likely that for the reader the application would change to different individuals and groups in different places and times. See Glenny, 128–129, 134–135, and 160–163 on 3:12.

Judgment of Bethel, Samaria, and the Sons of Israel, 3:13–4:6

It is difficult to determine a theme for this next section (3:13–4:6). Clearly the Lord is speaking (3:13, 15; 4:2, 3, 5, 6), but that continues in 4:7 also, and it is not

the reason for the break after 4:6. Also, there is no reason to think that the message for the priests, who are addressed in 3:13 and commanded to “bear witness,” breaks off after verse 6. One factor that may have contributed to the break after 4:6 is the emphasis on judgments focused on agriculture in verses 7–10; however, the main reason for a break at the end of 4:6 appears to be the refrain, “Yet you have not returned to me, says the Lord.” There is a break every time this refrain recurs in the next verses (4:8, 9, 10, 11).

At any rate, in B the priests are not a second group, experiencing the judgment of 3:12 (see text notes); instead, because the word “priests” begins 3:13, the priests are to bear witness to “the house of Iakob.” They are to tell them that when the Lord punishes Israel for their unfaithfulness to the covenant that punishment will reach to the houses of idolatrous worship at Bethel (3:14) and the houses of the worshippers (3:15). For the reader of the LXX “the house of Iakob” must be a warning to Judah, the “tribe” before whom the Samaritans are judged (3:12). The LXX contains the titular *κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ*, found only in the MP (13×) and ten times in Amos (3:13; 4:13; 5:8, 14, 15, 16, 27; 9:5, 6, 15). The title *παντοκράτωρ* emphasizes the Lord’s work of creation (5:8; 9:6) and that he is universally sovereign (4:13; 9:11); he is the God of the Jews and the gentiles (see Glenny, 186–189, for a discussion of the use of this term in LXX-Amos; also Tov, “Three Dimensions,” 91–92).

Verse 14 gives the reason why (διότι) the priests are commanded to “bear witness [of the sins of Samaria] to the house of Iakob” (3:13). The mention of “Baithel” (see 4:4) and the “altars” there connects the sin of Samaria with the cultic activity in those places, and “the house of Iakob” (3:13) is to understand this. But they are especially to understand that the Lord judges sin. The destruction of the altars in Bethel demonstrates the Lord’s superiority over the gods worshipped there and is further evidence of his almighty power (ὁ παντοκράτωρ). The main problem in 3:14 is the exact translation of *ἐκδικέω* (2×). The verb was discussed in 3:2, its only other occurrence in Amos, where it appears in a construction very similar to the first clause of 3:14 (“for this reason I will bring punishment upon you for all your sins,” 3:2). The first clause of 3:14 is most naturally understood to refer back to the same judgment as 3:2, both describing the Lord’s punishment of Samaria, and therefore, I have translated the verb the same in both places. In the second clause of 3:14, the verb refers specifically to the Lord’s judgment on the altars at Samaria and might have more of the sense of “taking vengeance,” which is often associated with this word (Dines, 118). I have again (as in 3:2) translated it “bring punishment upon,” because the judgment on the altars is connected with the judgment on the house of Israel described in the previous clause

(same verb), and it seems to be a part of that judgment. The noun ἀσέβεια, “ungodly acts,” found in the first clause of 3:14 occurs ten times in Amos and is used in the introductory formula to each of the eight judgment oracles in chapters 1–2 (“on account of the three ungodly acts ... and on account of the four”); the use of it again here would remind the reader of those oracles and emphasize their messages. The verb κατασκάπτω (in “the horns of the altar will be torn down”) occurs one other time in Amos as a participle in 9:11 (“I will raise up the parts of it that *have been broken down*”).

The two verbs at the beginning of 3:15 (“I will demolish and I will smite”) emphasize the total destruction of Samaria. The LXX rendering “the colon-naded house” (τὸν οἶκον τὸν περὶ πτερον) has the idea of a house “with a single row of columns all around” (LSJ, 1384). The only other time this word occurs in the LXX it refers to “shafts” or “sparks” of fire (Songs 8:6, 2×). Strabo gives the impression that the architecture described by this word was typical of Ptolemaic Egyptian temples (17.1.28; see Dines, 118, n. 27). The patristic commentators understood this as “winter palace” (Dines, 118, n. 27), and since it is called an οἶκος and “many other houses” are also destroyed with it, it is likely that most Greek readers would have understood it to refer to a dwelling place, rather than a temple. The columns around it would be a sign of wealth and luxury. The Greek text suggests a great destruction in which the houses of the rich fall upon each other and even luxurious ivory dwellings are destroyed.

The description of destruction is open-ended and concludes with the promise of the additional destruction of “many other houses,” which allows the prophecy to be applicable to the later destruction that comes on Judah. Such an open-ended prophecy is consistent, if the warning is intended for Judah, as suggested in 3:12–13 above. The fact that the book of Amos was intended for subsequent Judean readers, who were to learn from Israel’s history was, of course, emphasized in the LXX by the rendering “which he saw concerning Jerusalem” in 1:1. The repetition of the divine confirmation formula, with the warning in 3:13 and the verb at the end of 3:15, supports this connection, by its emphasis on God speaking in this passage. Readers at various stages of history would look for God’s message for them. (The absence of κύριος at the end of 3:15 in B is curious; see text notes.)

The command to “hear this word” beginning 4:1 repeats exactly the call to attention in 3:1 (cf. 3:13; 5:1). The command, addressed here to “heifers of Basanitis,” certainly introduces a new section of thought, although the scribe who copied B did not make a division in the text here. The thought unit of 4:1–3 further describes the sin of the wealthy in Samaria (3:1) and confirms their exile with an oath (4:2–3). Thus, the word that they are commanded to hear

is the Lord's oath that they will go into exile. Who the "heifers of Basanitis" are is a bit more problematic. The commentators and versions were divided on the question of whether they refer to men or women (Dines, 119–120). That the noun is consistently feminine in the LXX is no clear indication that "heifers" refers to women here. Occasionally Hellenistic writers use the word in the masculine to refer to a steer (LSJ, 368; Dines, 119), and the Targum of 4:1 has "men of wealth in the city of Samaria." However, the feminine form is used in Judges 14:18 ("my heifer") to refer to a young woman, and de Waard suggests that δάμαλις may have been employed "because of its other meaning 'girls,' a meaning attested as early as the fourth century B.C." ("Translation Techniques Used," 343; see also LSJ, 368). These women oppress the poor and needy to support their luxurious lifestyle.

The term κύριος (in "who say to their lords") means one who has authority or power over another, here possibly a husband, master, or god. In this context it probably refers to husbands, but I have translated it "lords" because the referent is not clear and because it seems to be an ironic contrast with the true Lord, who pronounces judgment on them in the next verse. The meaning of ἐπιδίδωμι is somewhat unclear; should it be translated "give [something]" or "bring [them (the poor and the needy)]"? The following verses, giving the purpose for this command, connect most directly if the command is to "give [something to drink]."

The prophecy against the women of Samaria continues in 4:2–3 in the form of an oath formula (see 6:8; 8:7), emphasizing its absolute inevitability. The Lord swears this oath "by his holy ones." The construction κατά with a genitive object, as in "by his holy ones," is commonly used in oaths to invoke someone or something (Mur, 404; LEH, 331; see Gen 22:16); often it refers to the victims over which the oath is taken (LSJ, 883). The preposition with a genitive object can mean "against," but the oath formula in this context rules against that understanding. (Dines, 121–122, discusses and rejects the translations "against" or "concerning.") The object of κατά invoked in 4:2 could be in the masculine, "his holy ones" (in Zech 14:5 of angels and in Isa 4:3 of believers), or the neuter, "his sacred objects" (Judg 4:12; 1 Macc 3:43; Lev 19:8; Zeph 3:4, etc.), referring to the sanctuary, cult objects, or offerings (Mur, 404). It is necessary to look at the following context before one can choose between these options.

The conjunction διότι could either introduce the noun clause that is the content of the oath (Mur, 129; Brenton), or be causal (Dines, 120; NETS), or be inferential (BDAG, 251). Mur uses the parallel construction in 6:8 as an example of διότι introducing a noun clause that is the content of an oath, but his understanding of the use of διότι in that verse is debatable (see Dines,

199). Although διότι can be equal to ὅτι and thus introduce a noun clause (LSJ, 435), all of the other uses of διότι in Amos (10 × in all) are causal or inferential (besides the two in question), and following the description of the sins of the “heifers” in verse one, it seems likely that this occurrence would be read as introducing an inference. Furthermore, one does not need a conjunction to introduce the content of an oath, and when one is used it is normally ὅτι. The fact that it precedes “behold” would not detract from a causal or inferential understanding of the conjunction; rather it supports it, because that same construction is found in 4:13; 6:11 and 14. With the inferential understanding of διότι the reason for the oath is the sins of the “heifers” in 4:1, and the oath follows from those sins. Thus, in a sense the following verses do give the content of the oath.

The phrase “Behold, days are coming” is used elsewhere in Amos to signal a new era of judgment (8:11) or blessing (9:13); it has an eschatological orientation in 8:11–12 and 9:13–15. The clause “they will take you with weapons” seems fairly straightforward.

Johnson (32) comments that one could hardly imagine a more confused translation than the LXX of 4:2b. To start with, the phrase τοὺς μετ’ ὑμῶν could be taken in several different ways. The most basic meaning of μετὰ with the genitive is “with,” but in this context it could have the idea of “in the midst of, among,” implying a group within a larger body, or “in common, along with,” which here might be no more than an expansion of “you” (i.e., “you” and “those along with you” would refer to the same group; see LSJ, 1108–1109 for the breakdown of the meanings). Also, this phrase could possibly mean “those against you” (see LEH, 298); this would change the focus of the judgment for a moment to be those who were appointed to take away the “heifers” to captivity. Although this is an attractive idea, it is highly unlikely without a verb of conflict (as 1 Kgdms 17:33) and would be the only time that μετὰ with the genitive is translated “against” in the MP. The construction τοὺς μετ’ αὐτοῦ in Amos 8:10 is similar to the construction in 4:2b, and it means something like “those with him [it]” (Dines, 251–253). The referent intended by “those with you” in 4:2b is unclear, but it certainly widens the objects of the judgment beyond the “heifers of Basanitis” (4:1). It includes in the judgment a special group within Israel or that was attached to Israel.

The phrase λέβητα ὑποκαίόμενον (“burning cauldrons”) also occurs in Jer 1:13 in the menacing vision of a boiling cauldron, tilted away from the north. The image recurs in Ezek 24:1–14 in the context of the siege of Jerusalem where Jerusalem is pictured as a pot emptied and burned clean over a fire. The verb, ὑποκαίω (“boiling”), which is a participle modifying λέβης (“cauldrons”) in Amos 4:2, occurs five other times in the LXX: Jer 1:13; Ezek 24:5; LXX Dan 3:25

and 46; and 4 Macc 11:18. The first two contexts have been mentioned above; in LXX Dan 3:25 and 46, part of the Song of Azarias in the Fiery Furnace, the verb is used to describe the fire and flames coming up from under the furnace to heat it. In the account of the martyrdom of the sixth brother in 4 Macc 11:18 this brother is laid out on the wheel and after his back is broken he is “roasted from underneath.” The noun λέβης is often used also in the context of persecution as an instrument of torture: 2 Macc 7:3; 4 Macc 8:13; 12:1; 18:20. In all these contexts in Maccabees it is an instrument used by Antiochus to torture the seven brothers, and it is always connected with fire, as the summary in 4 Macc 18:20 makes clear: “O bitter was that day—and yet not bitter—when that bitter tyrant of the Greeks quenched fire with fire in his cruel caldrons, and in his bitter rage brought those seven sons of the daughter of Abraham to ... more tortures” (NRSV). The tortures in his “cruel caldrons” (λέβησιν ὤμοις) “are singled out to represent all the inhuman tortures inflicted on the faithful Jewish brethren by Antiochus” in the peroration to 4 Macc (Dines, 129). From the connections in Jer and Ezek (see also Mic 3:3 and Ezek 11:3) we can generalize that caldrons were used metaphorically as images of “divine punishment on the elite of the land through the arrival of powerful enemies” (Dines, 125). They certainly convey the images of punishment and suffering.

One other connection between the persecution and tortures described elsewhere in the LXX by the words λέβης and ὑποκαίω and Amos 4:2b is the use of various forms of the verb βάλλω, used to describe the servants of the king casting the three Hebrew children in the furnace in LXX Dan 3:46 (various forms of the verb occur 4 × in the verse) and to describe Antiochus casting the sixth brother in the “caldron” in 4 Macc 12:1 (καταβληθεὶς εἰς λέβητα). In Amos 4:2b ἐμβαλοῦσιν seems to be a natural choice with the other vocabulary in the passage; this verb makes it clear that the “fiery destroyers” (ἐμπυροὶ λοιμοί) are personal agents of destruction, who are the subjects of the verb. With the descriptions of people being taken away “with weapons” and being thrown “into burning caldrons,” 4:2b communicates a scene of persecution or torture, perhaps even a scene of martyrdom (Dines, 130).

In order to understand Amos 4:2b one must determine the referents intended by the ἐμπυροὶ λοιμοί, the agents who cast those with the recipients into the “boiling caldrons.” In Amos 4:2b λοιμός is used as a noun, which I have translated “destroyers,” denoting a personal agent, and it is modified by ἐμπυροί, “fiery.” Since ἐμπυροί never functions as a noun, except in the neuter plural (LSJ, 467), it must be an adjective here modifying λοιμοί, which is functioning as a noun (LEH, 284–285); or at least it is a substantival use of the adjective (Mur, 349; in nonbiblical Greek λοιμός is always a noun, and the adjective is λοιμικός or λοιμῖος, LSJ, 1060). The adjective ἐμπυρός only

occurs one other time in the LXX (Ezek 23:37) where it describes the sins of the northern and southern kingdoms (Oola and Ooliba), who passed their children “through the fire” (δι’ ἐμπύρων) in sacrificing them to Moloch. Although the word often has a sacrificial connection in non-biblical usage, that does not seem to fit the context in Amos 4:2; nor is the idea of “burning” in a medical sense (like with a fever or pestilence; LEH, 148) appropriate in Amos 4:2, because λοιμοί must be personal and cannot mean a “plague, disease, pestilence” (BDAG, 602; LEH, 284–285). The adjective ἔμπυρος and its cognates are “fire” type words (LSJ, 466–467), and the simplest meaning for it in Amos 4, where it describes personal agents (λοιμοί), is “fiery” (Mur, 179). The implications of this word must await our discussion of one more word in the clause, λοιμοί.

HR (887) list only three occurrences of λοιμός as a noun in the LXX (3 Kgdms 8:37; Ezek 36:29; and 4 Macc 15:32), and each of these three readings appears to be a mistake. The occurrences of λοιμός classified as an adjective by HR (28×) include Amos 4:2, which they apparently took as a substantival adjective. In 1 Macc 10:61, 15:3 and 21 it describes a subversive element, people who are the enemies of the rulers. Especially important here, because of the suggested link between LXX-Twelve and LXX-Ezek (Tov, *The Septaugint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch*, 135–155), may be the terrible foreigners described in Ezek 28–32 (28:7; 30:11; 31:12; 32:12) that God sends against Tyre and Egypt to judge them. Dines (133) summarizes concerning the sense of this word in the LXX, “In every case it [λοιμός] has the derived sense of a pernicious, harmful person (a ‘pest’), one who flouts standards of public decency, political integrity or religious orthodoxy, at least from the writer’s point of view.”

The element that throws a different slant on the word in Amos 4:2b is the adjective, ἔμπυρος, “fiery,” by which the meaning of the noun is “strikingly expanded” (Satterthwaite, 19). “Fire” is an important judgment motif in LXX-Amos; the judgment of each of the nations in the seven oracles in 1:3–2:5 and the judgment of Israel in 7:4 are by “fire” (see also 4:10, 11; 5:6; and 4:9 with the cognate πύρωσις). In light of the emphasis in Amos on God’s judgment by fire and the context of Amos 4:1–3, it follows that these ἔμπυροι λοιμοί are agents of divine judgment, perhaps supernatural agents of judgment and destruction, who will cast those with the “heifers of Basanitis” into the “boiling caldrons” (so Satterthwaite, 19). Consistent with that interpretation is the fact that in verse 1 the Lord swears “by his holy ones,” likely angelic beings, to carry out this judgment. Furthermore, the phrase “days are coming” (4:2; 8:11; 9:13) suggests a future time of divine intervention in the contexts where it is found in Amos. The judgment here is potentially eschatological, but it could also be temporal.

By his expanded and interpretive translation of the passage the translator has combined an eschatological element with the historical judgment by the Assyrians. It is striking that he would bring this one element of eschatological judgment into a passage that otherwise speaks only of purely temporal judgments. The language in Amos 4:2 is “highly charged” (Dines, 136), and it probably draws on imagery from the punishment of Jerusalem, which is pictured like a cauldron in Ezek 11 and 24, the torture of the seven brothers in Maccabees, and the foreign nations (λοιμοί) that are sent to judge wicked Tyre and Egypt in Ezek 28–32.

Verse three returns to temporal judgment. The subjects in view are unclear; they could be the women of Samaria or perhaps, as suggested by the two groups in 4:2, a broader group. The preposition κατέναντι could mean “before,” “opposite,” or “in front of”; however, combined with “naked” (γυμνός), it seems to have the idea “before,” as “in the sight of.” “Naked” gives more detail to the description of deportation in the verb “you will be carried out” (ἐξενεχθήσεσθε) and emphasizes the shame and humility experienced.

The second clause of 4:3 suggests that the people of Israel will be “cast away” as useless (Mur, 59). “Before one another” in the preceding clause eliminates the idea that they are corpses. It is difficult to understand where they are cast (εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ Ῥομμάν). Ῥομμάν or very similar words (Ρεμμων 13×) occur several times in the LXX. The noun Ρεμμων occurs three times, in 4 Kgdms 5:18 (some texts have it in Amos 4:3; see text notes), referring to the temple of Rimmon, where Naaman’s master worshipped. It is believed that Rimmon (or Ramman, “thunderer”) is another name for Hadad, the Canaanite storm god also known as Baal, who was head of the Aramean pantheon. This is supported by the phrase “the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddo” (see Zech 12:11 MT; Palmer, 63–64; and ABD, 3:13). Thus, the subjects will be cast away onto the mountain of the Syrian god “Romman” (see ABD, 5:773–774 for possible geographical locations of “Rimmon”; none of the locations given is a mountain). This terminology suggests the place where Baal dwells or his homeland of Syria.

Verse 4 contains four aorist indicatives, apparently describing past actions and placing the cultic activity at Baithel and Galgala in the past. Baithel (3:14; 4:4; 5:5; 7:10, 13) and Galgala (4:4; 5:5) are mentioned more in Amos than in any of the other Minor Prophets. Baithel was one of the locations where Jeroboam I established an alternative place of worship for the Israelites in open opposition to the Mosaic Law (1 Kgdms 12:25–33). It is called “the house of the Kingdom” in Amos 7:13. Galgala was the first central sanctuary of the Israelites during the conquest (Josh 4:19–5:15), and Hosea describes it as a place of harlotry, wickedness, falsehood, and Baalism (4:15; 9:15; 12:12). The

Lord declares the certain future judgment of these two sanctuary locations in Amos 5:5. The continuation of second person plural subjects in verse 4 (see 4:1–3) implies that the addressees in 4:4 are the same as in 4:1–3. However, the apparent reference to a professional priestly class in 4:5a suggests they are also to be included in the descriptions of sacrificial activity in 4:4.

Several elements in Amos 4:4 echo sarcasm. First, it was in going to the sanctuaries that the people “broke the Law” and “multiplied impiety”; furthermore, the emphasis on “your” in “your sacrifices” and “your tithes” suggests the sacrifices were not acceptable to the Lord. They bring their sacrifices “in the early morning” (εἰς τὸ πρωὶ [3 × in Amos; also 5:8 and 8:4]) and tithes “for three days” (Mur, 562). The sins referred to are connected with the idolatrous activity in Baithel and Galgala, but the second half of the verse suggests they also involved the people’s dependence on outward ritual and sacrifices, with no heart for God or concern for personal righteousness (see also Hos 6:6; Mic 6:6–8).

The Greek word for “sacrifices” in 4:4b (θυσία) is a general word that is used for meat or non-meat offerings in the LXX (see the discussion in Muraoka, “Septuaginal Lexicography,” 46–47). Here the sacrifices are probably “animal sacrifice[s] offered as part of cultic institution” (Mur, 264).

In Amos 4:5 a plural third party reads a law “outside” and calls for votive offerings. The adverb of place, ἔξω, could mean “outside the cultic community,” perhaps Jerusalem, and the reference to “reading of a law outside” may be a rejection of the claims of the Samaritan Pentateuch (Dines, 146, n. 43). (“Law” here is anarthrous with no modifiers, and it need not refer to the Hebrew Scriptures.) If that is the case, the subjects doing the reading could be the priests and religious leaders of the Samaritan cult.

In the next clause the verb ἐπικαλέω may be ironic, since in 4:12 it refers to calling on God. It could be translated “called for” (Mur, 215), or it could be taken as “call on” or “appeal to,” as in 4:12 (LSJ, 635; LEH, 170). The former is more natural here. First, the unidentified subjects of this verb are also the ones who are reading a law in the previous clause, and this suggests they are not people “calling upon” or “appealing to” ὁμολογίας, but rather leaders “calling for” such things. The lack of a pronoun, such as “your” or “their” modifying ὁμολογίας, further supports this understanding of the verb. The clause is not describing people appealing to “their” ὁμολογίας, but rather leaders calling for ὁμολογίας.

The meaning of ὁμολογίας is difficult to determine. In the LXX the noun ὁμολογία (7 ×) sometimes refers to “the confession of sin or error” (1 Esd 9:8; Tov suggests it means “thanks” [“Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings,” 109]), sometimes it refers to a “vow” or “promise” (Jer 51:25 [2 ×]; probably Lev

22:18), and sometimes it refers to an offering made in accordance with a vow or promise (Deut 12:17; Ezek 46:12). In this context, referring to sacrifices and tithes (4:4), the latter meaning would be consistent. Thus, the unnamed subjects of 4:5a could be leaders calling for votive offerings (a type of peace offering) from the people. The context in Amos 4 and the parallel context in Jer 51:25(44:25 MT) suggest the translator had in mind offerings to fulfill vows made to another god, not the Lord. The Jer 51 context speaks of women performing their vows to burn incense to the queen of heaven (ποιήσομεν τὰς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν ἃς ὁμολογήσαμεν θυμῶν τῇ βασιλίσσῃ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ). The passage is similar to Amos 4 because in the LXX it is addressed only to women, and God ironically commands them to offer their sinful sacrifices. Also, the sin in both passages results in divine judgment. The Jer context suggests that the women referred to in 4:1–2 may be the ones addressed in this clause. (See Tov, “Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings,” 97–110, for a discussion of the ὁμολογέω word group in the LXX. He notes that the ὁμολογέω word group is often used in the LXX for the concept of giving thanks and argues that “this meaning has developed from an etymological procedure which identified two Hebrew roots, *הד/י*, ‘to confess’ and *הד/י*, ‘to thank’” [104].)

Theocharous (221–228) suggests that there is an allusion to outdoor worship in the time of Ezra in Amos 4:5. She argues for an allusion to 2 Esd 18:8(Neh 8:8 MT) and 19:3(Neh 9:3 MT) in the LXX text of Amos 4:5. In the 2 Esd context the people gather outside in the square in cold weather, and they ask Ezra to read the Torah to them. They then celebrate the feast of booths and confess their sins (2 Esd 18–19; see also 1 Esd 9:37–55 and Josephus, *Ant.* 11.148–153 and 154–158). If this worship in the days of Ezra is the background for the LXX interpretation of 4:5, then the “law” in Amos 4:5 is the Torah, and “outside” is outdoors. Being outdoors is a significant detail in the account, according to 1 Esd (9:6) and Josephus (*Ant.* 11.149), because it “underlined the seriousness of the situation and the urgency of repentance and action” (Theocharous, 225). If the translator has the 2 Esd context in mind here then the ὁμολογίας that are called for in Amos 4:5 are confessions, as in 2 Esd. Theocharous concludes that the LXX here is presenting past acts of worship in “an ironic accusatory manner.” According to the LXX “Amos [is] condemning the northern worshippers for a sort of national outdoors pseudo-confession which wants to mimic the one in Ezra’s time. It seems that a communal expression of public confession and Torah reading becomes the object of ridicule for the LXX translator when it is performed in the wrong context” (228).

It is impossible to determine whether 4:5 would have been taken to refer to the reading of the Samaritan Pentateuch by the religious leaders of the

Samaritan cult, or if it would have been understood to refer to the reading of the Torah outdoors, mimicking the worship in the days of Ezra, or if it would have been understood to refer to something else. However, the two options presented show how the historical situation or other biblical passages could influence the translator and/or the first readers of the LXX.

The command to “proclaim” (ἀναγγεῖλατε) concerning the “sons of Israel” in 5:5b must be addressed to a different group than the “sinners” described in 4:1–3; it seems to be addressed to the Lord’s spokesmen, the prophets. The content of the command is introduced by ὅτι. Of the eleven occurrences of ὅτι in Amos, all are causal, except in 9:8 and in this verse where it appears to introduce direct discourse, following the command to “proclaim.” “These things” that the Israelites love must refer to the ritual described in 4:4–5a. The context suggests that the last half of 4:5 is negative.

Satterthwaite (3) comments that Amos 4 is one of the passages in the MP where the translator’s use of Greek tenses is “particularly puzzling,” and that pattern continues in verse 6. The main verb is in the future tense (“I will give”), referring to future judgment, which the sovereign Lord will send on all the land. What is most puzzling is the return to the past tense in the refrain “you have not returned to me, says the Lord.” The reader would gather from this that the Lord expected the Israelites (and later readers also) to respond to the threat of judgment.

The emphatic personal pronoun at the beginning of 4:6 connects the Lord directly to the calamity described and marks it as judgment from him (see also 4:7; the pronoun is not emphatic in 4:9, 10, and 11). The adjective in the expression “toothache” (γομφιασμόν ὀδόντων) is a *hapax* in biblical Greek; its cognate verb occurs in Sir 30:10, where it refers to grinding or gnashing of teeth and Ezek 18:2, a context describing teeth that suffer or hurt. Either of these ideas is possible in Amos 4:6; LEH, 92 favors the former, and Mur, 102 and Dines, 146 opt for the latter idea.

One might wonder why the scribe, who was responsible for Vaticanus, chose to make a break in this long paragraph here between 4:6 and 7. Verse 6 is the first of a series of judgments that continues through 4:11. Apparently he was influenced by the refrain that concludes 4:6 (“Yet you have not returned to me, says the Lord.”), because he makes breaks after the parallel refrains in 4:8, 9, 10, and 11. I have translated the καί at the beginning of this refrain “yet” in each of the five refrains, because it “highlights a logical contradiction with what precedes” (Mur, 281; see also LEH, 221). The obstinacy of the Israelites makes no sense because they were missing the blessing that the Lord wanted to give them, and they were experiencing his judgments.

Drought Does Not Produce Repentance, 4:7–8

The emphatic first person pronoun at the beginning of verse 7 (as in 4:6) emphasizes the Lord's sovereign control of the weather patterns described in this passage. Drought was one of the covenant curses (Lev 26:19; Deut 28:22–24), and the Lord intended the drought described in these verses to cause Israel to return to him (4:8b); however, it does not have that effect on them. The verb tenses suggest the passage describes what the Lord is going to do. The verb tenses in the LXX are confusing, as in previous verses in this chapter. Verse 7 begins with an aorist and then has future tenses (and one subjunctive in 4:8) until the last clause in 4:8, in which he returns to an aorist. This gives the readers the impression they are in the midst of the judgment described; the Lord has withheld the rain, but he is going to cause it to rain and not to rain in the future (4:7).

The drought in the passage is serious because of its length and timing, which is three months before harvest (March–April) when the heads of grain are filling out. When the rain falls it is scattered, and the people “gather together” in the cities that receive some rain but there is not enough water to satisfy. This section concludes with the same refrain that concluded the preceding section in 4:6 (“Yet you have not returned to me, says the Lord”).

Sickness and Plagues Do Not Produce Repentance, 4:9

There are two main issues in this verse: the content of the judgment in the first clause and the points of division between the sentences. The judgment in the first phrase could be translated “with parching and with blight” (Brenton), referring to plagues on crops, or it could be translated “with fever and with jaundice” (Wolff, 210), referring to human sickness. The noun πύρωσις can mean either “parching” or “fever.” The more important word for determining the meaning of the clause is ἰκτερος, which outside of the LXX is “jaundice” (LSJ, 827). In Lev 26:16 and Jer 37:6 (30:6 MT) it refers to human sickness or jaundice; in 2 Chr 6:28 it refers to some kind of blight on crops (see also 3 Kgdms 8:37 in A). Here in 4:9 it is likely that the reader would understand it to refer to human illness like the first item of punishment in 4:6, “toothache.”

The second main problem in this verse is where to divide the sentences. Are the accusative nouns “vineyards” and “fig yards” part of what the people “multiplied” (Brenton) or part of what “the caterpillar devoured” (Dines, 148 and the texts of Ziegler, Swete, and Rahlfs)? I have followed the punctuation in the critical editions, which is the rendering that makes the destruction by the caterpillars greater and thus seems appropriate in light of the message of the concluding refrain, “Yet, even so, you did not return to me.” This

understanding results in a contrast between the clauses: “You multiplied your gardens” and “the caterpillar devoured your vineyards and your fig yards and your olive groves.” See Joel 1 for a fuller description of destruction caused by locusts and caterpillars. The ὥς in the conclusion of verses 9, 10, and 11 (“even so”) strengthens the refrain and signals that the judgments in 4:9–11 are more severe than the preceding ones, or they are climatic.

Death Does Not Produce Repentance, 4:10

Each of the first three clauses in this verse describes another of the Lord's judgments. In the first clause it is difficult to know the sense of θάνατος (Dines [148] “plague”; Brenton “pestilence”). It could have the idea of death resulting from pestilence, but that is not clear from the text, and I have simply translated it “death” (Mur, 255). The Lord sent death aimed or targeted at “you” (εἰς ὁμᾶς) “in the way to Egypt” (ἐν ὁδῷ Αἰγύπτου). For this understanding of this last phrase see van der Kooij (“The Septuagint of Zechariah”), 146, who rightly sees this idea in the phrase in Isa 19:23, 10:24, and most importantly Jer 2:18, which is very parallel to the construction in Amos, possibly from the same translator, and clearly refers to “the way to Egypt.” That the Lord sent death to his people in “the way to Egypt” would have connotations relevant to readers of the LXX (for the significance of Egypt in LXX-Hos see Glenn, “Ephraim Dwelt in Egypt”).

The main difficulty in the second clause in the verse is the phrase “along with captive bands of your horses.” There are many examples of αἰχμαλωσία used concretely in the LXX for a group of captives (Amos 1:6, 9; 9:14; LEH, 13; Mur, 13), and that idea seems to fit here where it refers to captured horses. The second person singular pronoun (in ἵππων σου) varies from the second person plural pronouns preceding it and following it in the verse. At any rate, the judgment in the second clause involves the slaying of young men and the capture of horses.

The third clause is a puzzling statement in Greek. The verb ἀνάγω is perplexing in the context of fire. Dines (148) notes, “There do not seem to be any contexts where it means ‘to annihilate,’ as needed here.” Mur (28) suggests the translation “sent up,” which is consistent with the main meaning of the verb, “to cause to move from a lower to a higher position” and makes sense in this context (“I sent your encampments up in fire”). The last phrase in this clause (lit. “in your anger”) is nonsensical unless the pronoun is understood as an objective genitive and translated “in [my] anger against you.”

The reference to “the way to Egypt” and “you” in this verse could have served as a special warning to readers of the LXX, and judgment by “fire”

is certainly consistent with the emphasis on judgment by fire elsewhere in Amos; however, with the past tense verbs throughout this verse, it is unlikely the readers would see it as referring to them specifically. The verse concludes with the same strengthened refrain as 4:9 and 11.

Near Destruction Does Not Produce Repentance, 4:11

The judgment on Israel described in this verse is in the past, as in 4:9–10. It is the most disastrous of all the judgments and is compared to the overthrowing of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 19:24–29), an expression signifying sudden and complete destruction (e.g., Deut 29:22; Isa 1:9; 13:19; Jer 27:40 [50:40 MT]; 30:12 [49:18 MT]). The LXX has no hint of any survivors in the first phrase. But the simile in the second phrase, “like a brand snatched out of the fire,” suggests there were a few who were severely scorched and rescued at the last minute (cf. Zech 3:2). Those who were “snatched out of the fire” should have recognized God’s hand in their deliverance and turned to him, but for the fifth time the Lord repeats the refrain that even this disastrous judgment did not bring Israel back to him.

Consequences of Sin and Doxology, 4:12–13

The warning judgments the Lord describes in 4:6–11 are apparently both future (4:6, 7b, 8) and past (4:7a, 9–11). The future judgments are hard to understand in light of the repeated refrain (4:6, 8, 9, 10, 11) that the people of Israel have not returned to the Lord. Perhaps the point is that prophecies about future judgment should motivate the people to return to God as much as judgments already experienced do. What is clear is that 4:12 contains the consequences (διὰ τοῦτο) of their stubborn rebellion and refusal to respond to the Lord’s punishment, described in 4:6–11 (cf. 3:2).

It is worth noting that the pronouns and commands in this verse are all in the singular. The address in the singular in 4:12 is a collective reference, referring to “Israel,” which is mentioned twice in the verse for emphasis.

The first two clauses of 4:12 are very parallel, each containing οὕτως ποιήσω σοι. The adverb οὕτως is difficult to interpret; I have taken it as a Hebraism meaning “such a thing” as in Gen 29:26; Matt 9:33; Luke 2:48 (LSJ, 1277). It must refer to the judgment that Israel now faces as a result of its stubborn rebellion and disregard of the Lord’s warnings. Because they have ignored the samplings of divine wrath designed to restore their relationship with the Lord, they now face a final and climactic judgment; it is probably what was foretold in 3:2 and reinforced in 3:11–12, 13–15, and 4:2–3.

The second clause is more complicated than the first; it begins with *πλὴν ὅτι*, two words that often function as a unit with the meaning “except that, save that” (LSJ, 1419). This combination occurs nine times in the LXX, with a variety of meanings; it only occurs twice in the prophets, both times in Amos; in 9:8 the two words function as a unit, introducing a “parenthetical after-thought” (“however” Mur, 463), but such an understanding of the words does not fit in 4:12. Amos 4:12 makes most sense if each word functions independently; the first conjunction, *πλὴν*, introduces a clause that qualifies the preceding statement, and the second conjunction, *ὅτι*, functions as a causal particle (“however, because”). The Lord is going to judge his people, Israel, but because he is, they are to prepare to call upon him (“your God”). Thus, the translator still offers hope of calling upon God.

The verb *ἐπικαλέω* “with its strong overtones of seeking and finding salvation ... interprets the divine threat ... as an incentive to repent and call upon the Lord [for deliverance]” (Dines, 149, n. 49). The designation of the God that Israel is to call upon as “your God” would be further encouragement for them to seek his deliverance. There seems to be no distinction between the “Lord” who is addressing Israel in this passage and the “God” whom they are to call upon; the “Lord” has already been called “God” in 3:13 and 4:3 and is emphatically so identified in the next verse.

Verse 13 is the first of three doxologies in Amos (see also 5:7–9[5:8–9 MT] and 9:5–6). They all stand apart from their contexts in regard to participles extolling the actions of the Lord and an identification of the Lord (“His name is ...”). However, the emphasis on the might and power of the omnipotent God of creation in verse 13 follows naturally the warnings of judgment and admonition to prepare to call upon him in the previous verse. The conjunction *διότι* (“because, for”) at the beginning of verse 13 reinforces the connection between verses 12 and 13. Israel should heed the warnings and admonitions given in 4:12 and prepare to call upon the Lord, because he is the kind of God described in 4:13, who is all powerful and controls all of creation; he will surely judge them for their sins, as he has warned he will do, unless they return to him.

The context demands that the five parallel anarthrous present participles in verse 13 be understood to be functioning as substantives. They are probably anarthrous because the translator was following closely the corresponding participles in the Hebrew, none of which has an article either. The subject of the verse is apparently the Lord, who is named at the end of the verse, but the references to “his anointed” and “his name” require that the Lord be describing himself in the third person. In B the subject is especially vague, since B does not include *ἰδοὺ ἐγώ*, which is found at the beginning of the

verse in many mss, thus seeming to loosen the connection with the Lord's speech in the previous verse.

"He who strengthens thunder and creates wind" at the beginning of 4:13 is very similar to the beginning of a long Septuagint addition in Hos 13:4, "establishing the heaven and creating the earth," which has the same two exact participle forms found in Amos 4:13. Furthermore, both of these passages contain direct speech by God, addressed to idolatrous Israel, contrasting God with idols and false gods (Hos 13:1–4; Amos 4:1–13). The context in Hos makes direct reference to Baal, and the reference in Amos to God establishing the "thunder" was likely anti-Baal polemic, since Baal was also known as Hadad ("thunderer"). The Old Testament writers often show that Yahweh and not Baal is the God of creation, and thunder and lightning are his weapons, not the weapons of Baal (Pss 77:18; 18:13–15). It is also possible that a LXX reader would see a polemic against the thunderbolts of Zeus in the reference to "thunder" and "wind."

Dines suggests that the Greek verb *στερέω* may have a precise scientific meaning in Amos 4:13. She proposes that possibly here it is reflecting "ancient beliefs about the causes of thunder: i.e., that it was produced by wind escaping from clouds as they thickened and grew heavier by the process of condensation" (151). She notes further that in expositing Amos 4:13, the Greek commentators referred to this phenomenon (Theodore 269C–D, Theodoret 1685C, and Cyril 488C), and that Aristotle discussed this and other theories in his *Meteorologica* (346b, 369a–b, and 371a, where he makes a close connection between wind and thunder).

In this context where it is parallel to "thunder" the second participial phrase in 4:13 (*κτιζων πνεύμα*), describing the actions of the Lord, apparently refers to the wind, rather than breath or spirit. Thus, I have rendered it "creating wind." This phrase was important in the debate about the full deity of the Holy Spirit in the early Church (Kelly, 255–258). It was argued that since the words next to *πνεύμα* in this verse refer explicitly to Christ, *πνεύμα* should most naturally be understood to refer to the Spirit, and thus the verse teaches that the Father created the Spirit. The orthodox countered this argument with proof from the Scriptures as a whole, appeal to the difference between the Hebrew and Greek in Amos 4:13, and careful analysis of the text. (Dines, 152–154, summarizes much of the argument and the importance of this verse in the early Church debate about the Spirit.)

The third participial phrase, "proclaims to people his anointed" (*ἀπαγγέλλων εἰς ἀνθρώπους τὸν χριστὸν αὐτοῦ*), is the most discussed of all five. The "anointed" could be a priest, which fits well with the cultic connections in 4:4–5. The modifying pronoun *αὐτοῦ* makes sense if "anointed" refers to a

High Priest worthy of God. If the “anointed” is a king, the phrase could refer to the past, especially to promises made concerning the Davidic dynasty. However, several pieces of evidence suggest that the phrase is more universal in its intention, and it indicates belief in the coming of an eschatological figure (see the discussion in Dines, 155). First, the words “proclaims to people” suggest a broad and public announcement of this information and include gentiles. This is consistent with the emphasis that the Lord God is ὁ παντοκράτωρ (4:13b and esp. 9:15) and that the gentiles are going to seek him (esp. 9:12, οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη). Second, a royal Messiah would be consistent with the eschatological interests elsewhere in Amos (esp. 7:1). Third, the description of the “tent of David” that is rebuilt in 9:11 is consistent with this interpretation (see discussion there). Also, it is worth noting that connected to its description of an eschatological Davidic Messiah, 2 Kgdms 23:3 uses epiphany language, as Amos 4:13 does. Finally, in B “anointed” is written as *nomina sacra*. Therefore, it is likely that a reader would understand the reference to “his anointed” in 4:13 as an eschatological, Messianic figure, who represents the Almighty God described in this verse. (See Glenny, 229–240 on messianism in LXX-Amos.)

The fourth participial phrase in 4:13, “he who makes daybreak and misty dark,” extols God’s omnipotence and work in creation, similar to the first two phrases. The first of the two objects, “daybreak” or “dawn” (ὄρθρον), seems to be contrasted with the second, “mist,” “fog,” “gloom,” or “darkness” (ὁμίχλην). Therefore, even though the second object normally has the idea of “mist” or “fog,” I have translated it “misty darkness” (so also Dines, 150; cf. Job 38:9). The merism means the Lord makes them both and everything in between.

The final participial phrase in 4:13, “and treads on the high places of the earth,” describes God in theophonic language as a mighty conqueror. “High places” has overtones of deity, control, lordship, and dominance (Mic 1:3; 2 Kgdms 1:19, 25), and to “tread on” them communicates God’s supremacy, dominance, control, and rule over all on the earth. Although judgment is a major theme in this context (4:12) and the book of Amos, judgment does not seem to be the main point of the imagery in this phrase. The present participle, like the other four present participles in the verse, suggests that this description of God transcends any one situation (gnomic present tense). They are all descriptions of God’s characteristic and ongoing activities, which set him apart from all other gods and distinguish him from humans.

This doxology ends with the refrain κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ ὄνομα αὐτῷ, identifying and further describing the subject of the hymn. This refrain is in the middle of the second doxology (5:8) and at the end of the third (9:6). I have translated it “the Lord, the God, the Almighty One” in an attempt

to give proper emphasis to the repetition of articles with the names. The meaning of the Greek seems to be that the Lord, he alone is God, and he is the Almighty One, who rules over all (LSJ, 1300; LSJ Supp, 238). That this is his name means it captures the essence of his person and describes his attributes and character. This description of the Lord, along with the acts of creation and power described earlier in the verse, establish him as the sovereign, omnipotent God, who is above all. This is also an implicit attack on Hermes, Zeus, Baal, and all other gods. It is also the basis for his judgment on Israel because of their lack of devotion to him.

A Funeral Dirge over the House of Israel, 5:1–15

The scribe who made the paragraph divisions in B begins a new paragraph in the text with the “funeral dirge” or “lament” (ἔρῃνος) in 5:1, separating this section from the preceding judgment oracle. He breaks up the funeral dirge over Israel between 5:15 and 16 and places in the next short section the final paragraph of the lament, 5:16–17, which picks up from 5:1–3 the theme of lament and concludes with a stern warning. “Woe” in 5:18 (and 6:1) marks off a new and distinct genre (woe oracle), which begins another paragraph in B (5:18–20).

In the preceding chapters the Lord has detailed Israel’s sins and the judgments that must come upon them for those sins if they do not repent. In fact, he has already visited them with chastening judgments to draw them back to him, but they have not responded to those judgments (4:6–11). Therefore, they are going to receive the climactic judgment he has been warning them about, and their only hope is to call upon him (4:12). He is the almighty, creator God, who will accomplish what he wills and what he has warned them about (4:13), and by implication they are foolish to delay a moment in their return to him.

The funeral lament in chapter five is a parody, an imitation of an existing literary form with inverted effects. The lament is for the nation of Israel (see Lam 1–4), which has died (5:2), and its army has been destroyed (5:3). The combination of lament (5:1–3, 16–17) and announcements of judgment (5:10–13) with exhortations to repent and seek God (5:4–6, 14–15) seem contradictory and create tension in the passage. The mention of the remnant in 5:15 provides the most likely solution to this tension. The nation is apparently doomed and has died, but at the same time the gift of life is offered sincerely to a remnant that will seek God and live, though the nation is destroyed. Thus, the lament section serves two purposes: it is a real lament pronouncing judgment and doom on the nation, and from the perspective

of the LXX reader it has been accomplished. At the same time it aims to move the responsive to change their ways and live; therefore, the offer of repentance and life in this section is real.

As mentioned above, the first three verses of chapter five are a unit functioning as a lament. The command “hear” in 5:1 is an attention-getting device (cf. 3:1, 13; 4:1; 7:16; 8:4). “Of the Lord,” gives the source of the oracle (“this word of the Lord”), and the word of the Lord here is further identified as a “dirge” (θρήνον): “a lament sung over some sad event” (Mur, 262; see Lam 1:1; Amos 5:16; 8:10). Here the event is the death or destruction of Israel (5:2–3). The preposition ἐπί could be “for,” “over,” or “against” (Dines, 157); seeking to be sensitive to the parody in this context, it makes more sense that the lament or funeral dirge be “for” or “over” rather than “against” its fallen subject (Ezek 26:17). The end of the sentence in 5:1 is not clear. Many feel that οἶκος Ἰσραηλ goes with the first verb in 5:2 (Brenton, Arieti, 64; Johnson, 33; Smith, 212; and Swete); others take these words as a further identification of the “you” addressed in 5:1, thus following the MT (apparently Rahlfs and Ziegler; and Dines, 157). If one follows the former option (“The house of Israel has fallen”), the recipients of the lament announced in 5:1 are indefinite; if one accepts the latter option, the “house of Israel” is the “you” addressed in 5:1. The connection of the vocative with the similar exhortations to “hear” in 3:1 and 4:1 argues for the latter option, but the punctuation in B is clear that in that mss οἶκος Ἰσραηλ goes with the first clause in 5:2.

The placement of οἶκος Ἰσραηλ also has implications for the understanding and arrangement of the words in 5:2, especially the phrase “the virgin of Israel” (παρθένος τοῦ Ἰσραηλ). If οἶκος Ἰσραηλ goes with the first clause in 5:2, then “the virgin of Israel” cannot be the subject of ἔπεσεν, but it could be the subject of either οὐκέτι μὴ προσθῇ (“never again”) or ἔσφαλεν (“has fallen” in 5:2b). Dines (157), Rahlfs, and Ziegler opt for the former, although they all connect οἶκος Ἰσραηλ with the first verb in 5:2 (ἔπεσεν). Brenton and Swete opt for the latter connection. B has a punctuation mark before παρθένος τοῦ Ἰσραηλ, indicating that those words must go with the following verb ἔσφαλεν, resulting in two parallel clauses: “the house of Israel has fallen” and “the virgin of Israel has fallen” (so Swete and Brenton). In my arrangement of the words in 5:1–2 I have tried to consider the syntactical and contextual evidence in the LXX, but I have especially followed the punctuation in B, which is reflected by my translation.

There are several items worthy of note in 5:2. First, the verb πίπτω at the beginning of the verse gives the image of “falling exhausted or in defeat in battle” (Mur, 458) in this verse. Second, the verb ἀνίστημι, twice in this verse (“never again to arise” and “no one will raise her up”), can have a

nuance of resurrection, although the national context here argues against it (see also 8:14). The Greek construction οὐκέτι μὴ προσθήσει is a calque, literally rendering the Hebrew idiom, and the genitive articular infinitive after this construction completes the verbal idea and is a complementary use of the infinitive. (C & S, § 60, d. call this usage the “prolative infinitive” after “extensible” verbs.) Also, the pronoun αὐτοῦ (“his [its] land”) in B is difficult to understand, since a feminine pronoun makes more sense in the context, and the majority of the Greek textual evidence has a feminine pronoun. Perhaps it was meant to agree with “virgin” (παρθένος), which was wrongly understood to be masculine, or more likely it is meant to be neuter (“its”). It is interesting that Israel is referred to with the masculine pronoun αὐτὸν in 5:6, apparently agreeing with οἶκος in that context. What is clear from the verse is that “Israel” is lamented as fallen in its own land and never to arise again. The “virgin” is wasted as one who is helpless, incomplete, and unfulfilled. The fates of the “house of Israel” and “the virgin of Israel” are the same.

Verse 3 finishes the first unit of this section with a description of the extent of death in Israel. This verse could be read as describing the “going out” of a military operation, but that would have to be implied in the LXX, and more likely the “going out” of cities (2×) would have been read as references to people going into captivity. Διὰ τοῦτο at the beginning of 5:3 indicates that 5:1–2 is the reason for, or cause of, what the Lord says in 5:3 (“for this reason”; see Dines, 158). The future tense verbs in 5:3 support this understanding. Thus, in B the fall of Israel (5:1–2) is the reason why there are few left in it (5:3). The formula (τάδε λέγει κύριος) is discussed in 1:3 and 3:11; it emphasizes the importance of the words that follow—they come directly from the Lord (see also 5:4). The verb “shall be left” (ὑπολείπω) has connotations of a remnant in some verses (Zeph 3:12; Zech 13:8; Isa 4:3; cf. its other two occurrences in Amos in 6:9), and thus, there is at least a hint here of the remnant explicitly mentioned in 5:14–15.

The commands, promises, and warnings of the subsection in verses 4–6 also give a slight glimmer of hope, after the lamentation in verses 1–3. The commands to seek and live in verses 4 and 6 form a chiasm that marks this subsection (“live” in 5:4 is a future indicative; see below). In 5:4 the conjunction διότι transitions to an inference resulting from 5:3, and it is best translated “therefore” (Brenton; cf. “because” in Dines, 158). It is because of the death of the nation decreed by the Lord in 5:1–3 that they are “therefore” now commanded to “seek [the Lord].” See the introduction to 5:1–15 for a discussion of this seeming contradiction and the part the remnant plays in resolving it.

The syntax of the final four words in 5:4 deserves attention. The Lord's command (aorist) to "seek me" should be understood as a "conditional imperative," stating the protasis of the condition, with the following verb, "and you will live," having the sense of the apodosis. There are several examples of imperatives in the NT that have this sense (Wallace, 489–492; BDF, § 387; Porter, *Idioms*, 226–227). Wallace argues that every undisputed example of a "conditional imperative" in the NT has a future indicative in the apodosis, and thus, the Greek syntax at the end of 5:4 fits that pattern (cf. the discussion in 4:6). However, as Porter cautions (*Verbal Aspect*, 352–353) and Wallace acknowledges, this does not remove the semantic force of the imperative. The Lord is commanding Israel to return to him, and if they do, they will live. The aorist imperatives here (ἐκζητήσατε also in 5:6 and 14) certainly have a sense of urgency in this context, as they often do, but they also stress the beginning of the action of seeking the Lord. The action of seeking the Lord (or good, 5:14) is presented as a whole, and it is not a momentary action, but the stress is on the beginning, the decision to turn from sin and seek the Lord. (See Wallace, 720, on what he calls the "pure ingressive" use of aorist imperatives.) The verb "seek," especially with the prepositional prefix, as here in Amos 5, suggests a concern with and total dedication to the thing sought; Mur (161) suggests the meaning here, "to engage oneself earnestly and devotedly in."

B has a punctuation mark between 5:3 and 4 and another after "the house of Israel" (τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραὴλ) in 5:4, which must be something like a colon before the command to "seek" the Lord. The command not to continue to seek Baithel in 5:5a is presented as the correlative of seeking the Lord. Baithel was the center of the idolatrous and corrupt alternative religion in Israel (7:10–17; see the comments at 3:14 and 4:4). The life that the Lord promises to Israel in 5:4 (also 5:6 and 14; cf. 8:14) is apparently physical, but the mention of "not rising again" in 5:2 suggests that there may be more involved (see Lev 18:5; Hab 2:4). The mention of gods "living" in the oath formulas in 8:14, a context that also refers to rising again (as 5:2), suggests a vitality or fullness of life that transcends merely the physical (Mur, 246).

The verb (εἰσπορεύομαι) in the command "do not continue to enter in to Galgala" has sexual connotations in its only other occurrence in Amos (see the discussion at 2:7 and Mur, 154; see also Hos 4:15). The idea of "entering in" is appropriate for sexual activity and idolatrous activity. In 5:5 "Beersheba" is rendered according to its constituent parts, "the well of the oath" (τὸ φρέαρ τοῦ ὅρκου; see also Gen 21:14, 31–33; 26:31), which is puzzling in light of 8:14 where it is transliterated "Bersabee." It was reoccupied by returning exiles (2 Esd 21:27), and there is evidence it was occupied in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman periods (EDB, 161).

The remainder of 5:5 gives two reasons why it is futile to go to the alternative worship centers. First, they cannot give life, as the Lord can. In fact, Galgala will be taken captive. The certainty of this prophecy is emphasized by a participle followed by a finite form of the verb. Second, Bethel “will be as not existing,” a rendering that would have been appropriate for the second century BCE when there would not have been a sanctuary there.

The prophet’s command to “seek the Lord” in 5:6 connects this verse with the parallel command in 5:4, and the repetition of the parallel idea signals the end of this subsection (5:4–6). The commands differ in that 5:4 was directly from the Lord, “seek me,” and the command to live, which was future tense in 5:4, is aorist here. (The original reading of B is a present subjunctive but two later scribes corrected it to the aorist indicative.) Wallace’s study of “conditional imperatives” (see 5:4) led him to the conclusion, “all of the undisputed conditional imperatives in the NT have a future indicative in the apodosis; and all of the possible conditional imperatives make the second verb (either imperative or subjunctive) act as if it were a future indicative” (490). In this context the subjunctive does seem to require a future sense. (See the discussion of the textual variants; several mss have a future tense.) Thus, the imperative “seek” is best understood as a command from the prophet, which together with the following subjunctive summarizes the Lord’s message in 5:4–5 (“seek the Lord and you shall live”). The purpose clause in 5:6b is a bit awkward following the imperative-subjunctive construction in B in 5:6a, but it must be understood as the purpose for the warning in the conditional sentence in 5:6a.

The purpose in 5:6b is introduced with *ὅπως μὴ* (“so that not” or “lest”) followed by two subjunctives (Smyth, § 2193 ff.). The design of the admonition is to prevent the “house of Ioseph” from being devoured by the fire of God’s judgment; they can seek the Lord and life, or if they continue to seek the alternative sanctuaries, they are choosing fiery destruction, a common judgment in Amos. The verb *ἀναλάμπω* suggests that the “house of Ioseph” could “flame up” at any moment; the verb can be used metaphorically of war breaking out (LSJ, 110), and it is always used in a positive context elsewhere in the LXX (Job 11:15, the countenance of the one approved by God; 2 Mac 1:22, the sun; Wis 3:7, the vindicated righteous; and Isa 42:4, the servant of the Lord). The “house of Ioseph” (cf. “Ioseph” in 5:15 and 6:6) originally referred to the Joseph tribes, Ephraim and Manasseh, but by extension it came to refer to all of northern Israel (Obad 18; Zech 10:6).

There is no explicit subject for the clause “and it will devour him,” but the “fire” of the previous clause must be understood as the subject of *καταφάγη*; the final clause in the verse confirms this. The masculine “him” is interesting

in light of the description of Israel as a *παρθένος* in 5:2. (See the discussion about the masculine pronoun in 5:2.) The masculine pronoun does agree with its immediate antecedent, “house of Joseph.”

In the final clause of 5:6 the future tense verb in B differs from the previous two aorist subjunctives following *ὅπως* *μη*. The future tense, connected by *καί* to the preceding purpose clauses with subjunctive verbs, apparently designates “some further consequence” that “has a kind of independence” but is related to the main purpose (BDF, § 369; see Isa 6:10; Rom 3:4); thus, it probably has the idea here, “and then there will be no one to quench it for the house of Israel.” The “house of Israel” would have a broad reference for the LXX reader.

Amos 5:7–9 is a hymn or doxology (cf. the other hymns in 4:13 and 9:5–6). In 5:7 the LXX refers to the Lord executing justice. The articular participle (*ὁ ποιῶν*), which begins 5:7 in B (see text notes), connects the verse with the rest of the hymn in 5:8–9, which has no finite verbs, only participles describing the Lord. The finite verb at the end of 5:7 (*ἐθίγκεν*) is the only finite verb describing the Lord’s actions in the three hymns.

Dines (159) notes that the phrase *ὁ ποιῶν εἰς ὕψος κρίμα* could be translated, “who exalts judgment” (cf. Job 5:11; BDAG, 1045); however, this rendering is probably not to be favored over “who executes judgment on high.” The hymn is a description of the actions of the Lord, and most of the actions are related to creation; thus, to make the more abstract statement that he “exalts judgment” seems out of place. Furthermore, at least seven of the about twenty-four times the phrase *εἰς ὕψος* occurs in the LXX it means something like “on high” (4 Kgdms 19:22; Pss 7:8; 67:19; 74:6; Isa 7:11; 37:23; 40:26; and the only other occurrence of the phrase in the Twelve, Hab 2:9). The adverbial sense of the phrase, “over and above, very greatly, exceedingly” (1 Chron 14:2; 23:17; 29:3; 2 Chron 1:1), is also out of place here. Most importantly, the LXX context places side-by-side what goes on above and on earth: the Lord “executes” (*ποιῶν*; LEH, 383) judgment on high and he has “established” (*ἐθίγκεν*) justice on the earth. “On high” then refers to the awesome and incomparable place of God’s presence in the heavenly sphere (Pss 7:8; 67:19; Isa 40:26), where in Scripture he is often portrayed as dwelling; in this verse he is portrayed as enforcing his will there. By contrast he has established standards of justice “on earth,” but nothing is said about him enforcing those standards as he does in heaven. The contrast between the aorist indicative, “he established,” at the end of 5:7 and the present participles in the remainder of the hymn is striking. The present participles would suggest that the activities of the Lord they describe are customary and characteristic of the Lord, thus reflecting his nature and character. Whereas, in this context, the lone aorist indicative

seems to be a consummative aorist emphasizing the endpoint of the action described, the Lord's establishment of a fixed standard of justice that does not vary, as my translation "established" suggests (Fanning, 157, 263–265).

The continuation of the hymn in Amos 5:8 begins with the same participle construction that begins 5:7 (ὁ ποιῶν), connecting the material in these verses and continuing the description of the Lord's great deeds (see text notes). The creation context in 5:8 requires a different translation of this multi-purpose verb than in 5:7. The deeds of the Lord described in 5:8 focus on his unlimited power personally to control and change the forces of nature on the earth. The first participle ("he who makes all things") is the most basic description of the Lord's control over the forces of nature: he made it all! The second participle, μετασκευάζων ("transforms [them]"), describes his ability to change what he created. Μετασκευάζων is awkward, because it has no explicit object. Since a καὶ immediately precedes and follows μετασκευάζων, it is best to take it as a separate phrase, rather than a compound verbal with the following synonymous participle (ἐκτρέπων). It apparently has the same object as the previous participle ("all things"; so Brenton and Dines, 159; Wolff, 229, n. t), and I supplied "them" for its object, referring back to "all things" in the first phrase. The following participial phrases in the verse describe how the Lord transforms and changes what he created.

The next two participial phrases are structured chiasmically and praise the Lord for his control over the alterations of day and night (see 4:13). It is interesting to compare the third participial phrase in 5:8, "he also changes [ἐκτρέπων] the shade into the early morning," with the parallel description of the Lord's control of creation in 8:9 (see discussion there). Turning "shade" (σκιάν) to morning does not make a lot of sense; the reader probably would have understood it to mean going from darkness to morning (see discussion of textual issues). The next participial phrase completes the chiasm by describing the Lord as the one who "darkens day into night." This phrase could foreshadow the Day of the Lord, which is described as a time of darkness in 5:18 and 20.

The third example in this hymn of the Lord's ability to change and transform forces of nature is his control of the waters (5:8b). The Lord, not Baal or any other storm god, is the one who summons to the clouds the life giving (and at the same time destructive) water from the sea and in turn pours it back on the earth. There are two participles in this description of the Lord's activities. He "summons" the water from the sea; this verb (προσκαλέω), which is predominantly middle voice in the LXX, has connotations of summoning into his presence or calling in a legal or official use (BDAG, 881). Here the sense is more general. In turn, he "pours out" this water "on the surface of

the earth.” Whether the pouring out here is rain or flood waters is difficult to determine. The verb ἐκχέω can certainly refer to a profuse pouring out (LSJ, 526) and is more than would be necessary to refer to rain. This whole phrase is repeated exactly in 9:6, where the context speaks of the Lord’s destructive powers (esp. 9:5 and 8), and that may well be its sense in 5:8 also. The next verse supports this understanding of it.

At the end of 5:8 the reader learns that the subject of this hymn is κύριος. See the discussion of the title of God in the first hymn (4:13). Two things are important about the title in 5:8. First, it is not at the end of the hymn, as one would expect and as in the other two hymns (cf. 4:13 and 9:6). Second, the title of God in B agrees with the MT exactly but differs from many other Greek manuscripts, which add ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ.

The hymn continues in 5:9 with two more participles describing the activities of the “Lord,” who was identified at the end of 5:8. The activities of the Lord in 5:9 do not involve his control of the natural realm, but his governance in the moral realm, and thus, they prepare the reader for the return to the theme of judgment in 5:10. The two realms are not unrelated: “All human strength and all human means of might and protection cannot prevail against [the Lord], precisely because he is the omnipotent creator” (Paul, 170, translating Rudolph, 201). The focus in 5:9 on the strong and their fortresses is consistent with the emphasis earlier in Amos (chs. 1–2; 3:11–12, 15; 4:1–3). The use of the singular nouns “strength” and “fortress, stronghold” without modifiers gives an abstract tone to the Greek translation. It is as if the Lord is dispensing ruin on an abstract quality of strength; however, the context makes it clear that the ones upon whom the Lord brings ruin and distress are those who feel secure in their own “strength” and “fortress” and see no need to seek him and his help (5:4, 6). The objects of the Lord’s actions could be nations or individuals. But neither “strength” nor “stronghold” will deliver them from the justice and judgment of the Lord (5:7). He created all things and controls all in the natural realm (5:8) and in the moral realm (5:9).

Amos 5:10–13 returns to the theme of injustice, listing accusations against the ungodly and the resulting punishment. In 5:10 the subject of the verbs changes from singular participles, referring to the Lord (5:7–9), to third person plural indicatives, apparently referring to the wealthy oppressors of the poor. The subjects of the two verbs in 5:10 and the first verb in 5:11 (all third person plurals) are distinguished from Israel, which is addressed with second person plural verbs in 5:1–7. The change to the second person, referring to Israel, with the second verb in 5:11 further supports this understanding of 5:1–11. Thus, it seems likely the wealthy oppressors who are the subjects in 5:10–11a are foreigners, but they could be a minority in Israel. The two main verbs

in 5:10 describe emotions of the oppressors, which find expression in their sinful actions; both are constative aorists, describing the sin as a whole or in summary fashion. The sin is understood here to be in the past (see 4:7–11), although there is no indication it has come to an end.

The first accusation in 5:10 refers to their hatred of one who “reproves,” i.e., raises questions concerning the morality of actions or people (Mur, 173; see also TDNT, 2:473–475). The word translated “reprove” (ἐλέγχω) is connected in the LXX with several aspects of judicial proceedings (Isa 11:3, 4; 29:21; Job 13:3; 32:12; see also LSJ, 531), and the fact that the reproving takes place “in the gateways” is strong support for a court situation in this context. “The gates” were “a forum for public gatherings, a public square” (Mur, 498; see also LEH, 412, and ἐν πύλαις in 5:12, 15 and Prov 12:13; 22:22; 31:23, 31; Isa 29:21). Thus, the “reproof” that is hated in 5:10a could be any number of activities or roles involved in a court situation (judge, lawyer, testifier, etc.). But whatever the specific role involved, the explicit sin addressed is hatred of an honest legal process, and the sin implied is the attempt to manipulate and control the legal process in order to favor special interests and to bypass justice. See the long LXX addition at the end of Hag 2:14, which includes the same vocabulary as this clause.

The verb “loathe” (βδελύσσω) in the second accusation in 5:10 is very strong (4× in the MP; see Hos 9:10; Am 6:8, where it is also parallel to “hate”; and Mic 3:9). In Lev 20 it is used to describe God’s attitude concerning the terrible sins of the Canaanites (20:23). In the middle form, as in Amos 5:10, it means “to detest something because it is utterly offensive or loathsome” (BDAG, 172; see Mur, 85–86). The subjects loathe “pious speech.” The adjective “pious” is used of God to describe his holiness and of humans to describe their piety or godliness (Mur, 417–418; also BDAG, 728). BDAG, 728, has a helpful summary of its meaning in the Greco-Roman world where “this term for the most part described that which helps maintain the delicate balance between the interests of society and the expectations of the transcendent realm. For example, the ὅσιος person prays and sacrifices to the gods (Pl., Euthyph. 14b), is conscious of basic taboos (hence wary of pollution because of bloodshed [ibid. 4de; cp. Od. 16, 423]), and observes traditions of hospitality (on Zeus as protector of the strangers, s. Od. 9, 270 f.).” In its only other use in the LXX Prophets (Isa 55:3), it is often rendered the “mercies” of David, perhaps referring to his character. The people who are described in Amos 5:10 have a deep-seated and intentional commitment to injustice. Their hearts and values are opposite of God’s. Note the similar attitude and vocabulary in Prov 21:15.

“Therefore, because” at the beginning of 5:11 is a bit awkward. It is best to understand “therefore” (διὰ τοῦτο) to introduce an inference from what

precedes (sometimes “for this reason,” Mur, 113). This is its function the other eight times it appears in Amos (2:13; 3:2, 11; 4:12; 5:13, 16; 6:7; 7:17). Thus, it connects the judgment announced in 5:11 with the attitudes and values portrayed in 5:10. “Because” (ὅτι ὡν), which was a favorite phrase of the translator in chapters 1–2 (1:3, 9, 13; 2:1, 6) where he alternated it with ἔνεκα (1:6, 11; 2:4; cf. 2:6 and 6:10), introduces a compound, subordinate, causal clause in 5:11, which precedes the main statement in the latter part of the verse. To summarize the thought connections in 5:11, Amos 5:11b is the main clause, the Lord is going to judge by not allowing “you” to enjoy the houses and vineyards “you” gained by receiving gifts from the oppressors; Amos 5:11a gives the reason or cause of this judgment (“they” oppressed the poor, and “you” received gifts “from them”), and the verse is an inference from 5:10 (“Therefore, because”).

In B (and several other mss; see the textual notes) the first verb in 5:11 is third person plural, agreeing with the verbs in 5:10. This is awkward, since there is a clear sentence break between verses 10 and 11 and all the other verbs in 5:11 are second person plural. Furthermore, if the first verb in 5:11 is third plural instead of second plural, it changes the sense of 5:11–12, as discussed below. The subject of the verb “they were buffeting ... with their fists” (κατεκονδύλιζον) must be the same indefinite “they” of 5:10, and the imperfect tense, describing customary or habitual action, distinguishes it from the other verbs in 5:11, which are all aorist. This compound verb only occurs this once in the LXX; its simple form occurs only in the LXX in Amos 2:7 and Mal 3:5 (both LXX additions). The related verbal noun (κονδύλισμός) occurs once in the LXX (Zeph 2:8) where it means “revilings, insults.” In 5:11a the plural “poor” tends to make the objects and the actions against them more specific than a generic singular (as in the MT).

The second verb in 5:11 (δέχομαι) begins a string of second person verbs in 5:11. The “them” in “you received gifts from them” are the oppressors, as they were in the previous three clauses, and the “you,” who are the subjects of the verb must be Jews, who cooperate with the oppressors and “received choice gifts from them.” In this context “choice gifts” (δῶρα ἐκλεκτά; cf. Deut 12:11) must refer to expensive items “gained through extortion”; in the LXX the noun δῶρον often refers to a “bribe or payment made to influence a judge” (Mur, 138; Exod 23:7–8; Deut 16:19; Isa 5:23; cf. Deut 10:17; Mic 3:11; Isa 1:23). (See Glenny, 53–56 on some of the changes the translator made to the Hebrew *Vorlage* in this verse.)

The remainder of 5:11 explains the result of receiving “gifts” of that taken from the poor. “You” (apparently Israelites) have built houses of “hewn stone” at the expense of the poor, but you will “never settle down and be at home in them.” The negation here is emphatic (οὐ μή with the subjunctive). The verb

κατοικέω has the idea “settle in” (LSJ, 928) or “live as permanent resident” (Mur, 311). Thus, it does not mean that they would never inhabit the houses, but that they would not settle in and enjoy them. In the only other occurrence in the LXX of the adjective “hewn” (ζεστός) it refers to polished stones used in a monument (1Macc 13:27).

The Jews who received choice gifts from the oppressors will also spend large amounts of the money they received to “plant desirable vineyards,” but they will never (οὐ μὴ with the subjunctive again) drink the wine from them. The two uses of καί in the last half of the verse are adversative (Mur, 280–281), pointing to the contrast between their labor and lack of enjoyment. This judgment is the fulfillment of the covenant curse (Deut 28:30 and 39; Isa 18:5; Mic 6:15; cf. Amos 9:13). The adjective “desirable” (ἐπιθυμητός) modifies “vessel, object” (σκεῦος) seven of the fifteen times the adjective occurs in the LXX (referring to precious articles in 2 Chron 20:25 and 32:27; temple vessels in 2 Chron 36:10, 2 Esd 8:27, and 1 Macc 1:23; riches in Hos 13:15; riches of Nineveh in Nah 2:10). The adjective is used in Greek literature for the “cravings” of pregnant women (LSJ, 634). The verse suggests that Jews, who sympathize with those who oppress poor and defenseless Jews, have glutted their every desire with the gifts they received for their cooperation with the oppressors.

The first clause in 5:12 gives the reason (ὅτι) for the judgment in 5:11b. The Lord continues to address Jewish collaborators, referring to them in the second person plural, following the sense of 5:11. The Lord knows their “many ungodly deeds” (πολλὰς ἀσεβείας). The noun ἀσέβεια is a favorite in Amos (10 ×). It is used in each of the eight judgment oracles in chapters 1–2 to describe the wrongdoing of the nation addressed and thus the reason for their judgment (see the discussion above at 1:3 and 3:14).

With the second clause in 5:12 a new sentence begins in B, which continues to the end of the verse. An equative verb must be supplied in the main clause of this sentence, “And your sins [are] weighty,” and the rest of the verse contains participial phrases modifying the main clause. In B the first participle is adjectival (nom., fem., pl.) modifying “sins” (see text notes), showing that the sins involve “trampling upon the just man.” The following adverbial participles in the masculine apparently modify the same Jewish collaborators addressed throughout 5:11b–12 and give two reasons why their sins are so weighty (“because you are ...”). All three participles are present tense, suggesting the actions described are regular or characteristic.

The adjective “weighty” or ἰσχυρός, which normally means “strong,” has the idea of “grave, serious” here (Mur, 273). The participle καταπατοῦσαι explains that the “sins” involve “trampling on” or “dealing harshly and oppressively with” (Mur, 302; cf. 4:1) the one who is just. “The just man” (δίκαιον) must be

understood generically. “In Greco-Roman tradition a δίκαιος person is one who upholds the customs and norms of behavior, including especially public service, that make for a well-ordered, civilized society” (BDAG, 246; see Mur, 127). In its two occurrences in Amos this term is parallel to the “poor” (see also 2:6).

The two adverbial participles (nom., mas., pl.) at the end of 5:12 describe the actions of the Jewish collaborators and give the reason why their sins are so serious. First, they “take bribes.” “Bribes” (ἀνταλλάγματα) occurs at least nine other times in the LXX. It has the general meaning of “that which is given or taken in exchange for” something else (LSJ, 149), and it could be rendered with several different English words depending on the context (“price” 3 Kgdms 20:2 and Sir 6:15; “exchange” Job 28:15; “reverse” Ps 54:20; “recompense” Jer 15:13; see also Ruth 4:7; Ps 88:5; Sir 26:14 and 44:17). Muraoka agrees that it virtually equals a “bribe” here. (See Muraoka’s discussion of this word without the ἀντ- prefix, which is the form found in several mss [Mur, 19]; the ἀντ- prefix certainly does not take away from the idea of a bribe.) The Jewish collaborators are in positions of power and leadership and are willing to “take bribes” to overlook wrongs done against the poor, which results in their own enrichment.

The final sin described in 5:12, “doing injustice to the poor in the gateways,” again picks up on the vocabulary of 2:6–7, as much of this context has done. See the discussion at 2:6 on “poor” (πένης). “In the gateways” clearly refers to a court or legal situation in this context (Mur, 498; see the discussion at 5:10 and 15); this is where justice was supposed to be dispensed. See 2:7 for the other use in Amos of the flexible verb ἐκκλίνω, which is the root of the participle “doing injustice” (Mur, 163; LSJ, 509). In 5:11b–12 in Vaticanus the Lord especially addresses the sins of Jews (“you”), who were collaborating with (“received choice gifts from”) oppressors (“they, them”), described in 5:10–11a.

Amos 5:13 is an inference from the preceding (διὰ τοῦτο). Mur (538) suggests the translation “prudent” for ὁ συνίων, which has the same meaning as the adjective συνετός. The attributive participle is a generic reference to the kind of a person who has intelligence, knowledge, and understanding. “At that time” can have a more technical meaning in the prophets (i.e., “Day of the Lord”; Mic 3:4; Joel 3:1; Zeph 3:16, 19, 20), but most often it simply refers to a designated or specific period of time, as here in 5:13. The causal clause that ends the verse explains why “the prudent will be silent”: “Because [ὅτι] it is a time characterized by evils.” The genitive “evils” gives the characteristic or quality of the time (attributive genitive); the plural form suggests “evil deeds” and not just evil in the abstract. Apparently the prudent man knows it will

do no good to speak; perhaps he is afraid, or perhaps he realizes that the only thing that will be effective to change the situation is the intervention of the Lord. The fact that 5:13 is an inference from the sins in 5:12 suggests that the silence of the prudent is a judgment from the Lord.

Verses 14–15 form a subsection in the large paragraph 5:1–15. The command to “seek the good” corresponds with the commands to seek the Lord in 5:4–6. In 5:4–6 the command to “seek the Lord” (or “me” in 5:4) was defined in terms of what it was not (seeking Baithel and Galgala) and was developed negatively by a description of what would result if the Israelites did not seek the Lord. In 5:14–15 the command to “seek good” is also defined in negative terms (“not evil”), and the command is developed positively by what would result from seeking the Lord. The verb form in 5:14 for the command “seek” (ἐκζητήσατε) is exactly the same form as in 5:4 and 6. The “good” (τὸ καλὸν) the people are commanded to seek in 5:14 must be moral good (Mur, 286), because its opposite in this context is “evil” (τὸ πονηρόν). The use of articles with these two abstract nouns is good, idiomatic Greek (Smyth, § 1131–1135). By their very nature abstract nouns focus on a quality; however, when they are articular the quality is more closely defined and distinguished from other notions than it is when they are anarthrous (Wallace, 226). Here the article heightens the distinction between the two opposites, and in this context “good” refers to justice and equity (cf. esp. 5:15). The emphasis on seeking what is moral or acceptable to the Lord, placed parallel to seeking the Lord himself, emphasizes that these two responsibilities go together, and to seek the Lord is also to seek to do good to others.

The purpose for the pair of complementary commands in 5:14a (“seek the good and not evil”) is marked by ὅπως with the subjunctive ζήσητε, “so that you may live.” This same verb is used as a motivation to seek the Lord in 5:4 and 6 (see the discussion at 5:4). The clause following the purpose clause is connected to it with καὶ and contains a future tense verb, parallel to 5:6. As discussed there, this construction apparently designates “some further consequence” that “has a kind of independence” but is related to the main purpose (BDF, § 369; see Isa 6:10; Rom 3:4); thus, it probably has the idea here, “and then the Lord ... will be with you,” describing the life referred to in the main purpose clause. The comparative conjunction οὕτως (“in this way”) further correlates the clause following the purpose clause (“in this way the Lord ... will be with you”) with the purpose clause (BDF, § 453; Mur, 424–425). The correlation indicated by οὕτως is not with ὃν τρόπον εἶπατε (“in the same way as you say”), which follows, because these words are separated by a punctuation mark and go with the following sentence in 5:15 (first person plural verbs; see below). Thus, “so that you may live,” which

is the purpose of seeking the Lord, is presented as correlative to a promise that the Lord will be present with those who seek him (cf. Deut 30:20), and the presence of the Lord with them is part of the life that they may find, if they seek him. Therefore, in this context life or living, which is correlative to the Lord's presence, is not limited to mere physical existence. See 4:13 on the divine name here, "the Lord, the God, the Almighty One" (cf. 5:15 and 27). (The awkward word order in 5:14 is because the translator is following closely the order in the Hebrew.)

As mentioned above, the last words in 5:14, "in the same way as you say," go with 5:15, and therefore the first two verbs in 5:15 (first person plurals) are a quotation, which contains the contents of the formula "in the same way as you say," at the end of 5:14. Thus, in 5:15 the people are describing their conduct: "We hate the evil things, and we love the good things." The perfect tense of these stative verbs has the force of a present tense here, emphasizing the existence in the state of hating and loving (Porter, *Idioms*, 41; Wallace, 579–580), and the perfect tense marks or intensifies these actions. The neuter plural abstract nouns "evil things" and "good things" both have the article (see 5:14 on this idiom).

"In the same way as you say, 'We hate the evil things and we love the good things'" is not connected with the complex structure that precedes it. I take the punctuation at the end of these words to be a comma and understand them to be connected with what follows by means of the καὶ in 5:15. In this way the command to "restore judgment in the gateways" is a command to manifest what is claimed in 5:15a, and the purpose clause ending 5:15 is only dependent on this one command. The aorist imperative "restore" (ἀποκαθιστάνω), which summarizes what the Lord requires, suggests that judgment had previously been practiced. The purpose for restoring judgment in the "gateways" (here the courts, see 5:10 and 12) is marked again by ὅπως with a subjunctive; it is so that "the Lord ... may have mercy," thus giving hope. For a discussion of the divine name here, see 4:13 and 5:14. In 5:15 the possibility of mercy is limited to the "survivors of Ioseph," thus indicating that even if the people would restore justice this will not avert the already announced judgment of the Lord. Furthermore, in this context the "survivors of Ioseph" will be those evidencing a moral-ethical lifestyle. The word "survivors" (περιλοίπους) only occurs one other time in the LXX (Ps 20:13) and has the idea of what is "left remaining" (Mur, 452), here the "remnant" (LEH, 370). On "Ioseph" see 5:6 and 6:6. The "survivors of Ioseph" language may have its origin in Gen 45:7.

There are at least three applications of the remnant motif in LXX-Amos. First, it applies to a group that survives a historical catastrophe (1:8 and 9:1) and later perishes. Second, it refers to those who seek the Lord and

develop a relationship with him, which is demonstrated in a moral-ethical lifestyle, and as a result they survive the Lord's judgment (5:15). Finally, it is applied to a "remnant of mankind" that will be part of the eschatological restoration of David's kingdom (9:12). Therefore, the remnant motif in Amos conveys both doom and blessing. It is the key to reconciling the seemingly contradictory announcement of the death of the nation of Israel (5:1-3) and the promises of deliverance and life for those who will seek the Lord (5:4-6, 14-15). The remnant theme would give hope to pious Jewish readers of the LXX and also be a basis for inviting their Gentile neighbors to consider Judaism.

Δ. Amos 5:16-7:9

Summons to Mourning, 5:16-17

The Δ in the left margin at the beginning of 5:16 in Vaticanus marks this as the beginning of a major division (5:16-7:9). In B 5:16 is also a new paragraph, marked by the extension of the first letter into the left column. The elaborate summons to mourning beginning in 5:16 apparently suggested a new division to the scribe. Punctuation marks in B divide the paragraph into four sentences.

This short paragraph continues the theme of the previous paragraph (διὰ τοῦτο). The oracle in 5:16-17 comes directly from the Lord, as stated at the beginning and end of the section (see 1:6 on "thus says the Lord"). Again the divine title is κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, a favorite title in this section (4:13; 5:14, 15, 27). "Lamentation" and "mourning" (κοπετός and πένθος) are parallel terms (see Mic 1:8) and especially refer to the expression of grief for the dead (Mur, 325, 447). The theme of grief for the dead is further emphasized by the interjection "Woe!" and the mention of a "funeral dirge." The interjection is a Semitism, a "transcription of the Hebrew" (BDF, § 4); it denotes pain, grief, or horror (LEH, 342; BDAG, 734). The mention of the "funeral dirge" (θρῆνος) connects this oracle with the "funeral dirge" in 5:1 (see also 8:10). The repetition of πᾶς ("in all the streets ... in all the roadways") emphasizes the extent of the mourning. The need to summons "farmers," who would not be skilled in lamenting, to help with the lamentations further emphasizes the scope and intensity of the death. Thus, when the "farmer is summoned to ... those knowing a funeral dirge" it apparently means he is summoned to join with others who are skilled in these activities.

The reason for the death and overwhelming grief described in 5:16-17 is given in the διότι ("because") clause at the end of 5:17. The Lord says, "I

will pass through the midst of you.” “You” is singular, apparently referring to the nation. The verb ἔρχομαι can refer to “any kind of motion” (LSJ, 695), and the context requires some type of passing through action. The Lord is the immediate cause of death in this passage, and no intermediate plague or army is envisioned. Whereas the protective presence of the Lord was connected with life and blessing in 5:14, in 5:17 his presence brings death and lamentation. It is the same Lord in both verses; the difference is the response of the people to him and his call for righteousness.

The Day of the Lord, 5:18–20

This short paragraph addresses one topic, which is mentioned specifically three times in the three verses, the Day of the Lord. The paragraph is introduced with an exclamation of “Woe!” plus a plural participle, very similar in construction to 6:1. The “Woe!” also connects the paragraph with the immediately preceding section (see 5:16 for a discussion of this interjection). Logically this paragraph addresses an issue that follows from the preceding. It removes any false hopes the people may have had that because they were “God’s people” he would not judge them, but instead he would punish their enemies and deliver them when he intervened in the affairs of this world. Instead, the time of the Lord’s intervention, the Day of the Lord, is to be lamented and mourned, because “God’s people” are also his enemies.

The substantival participle of direct address at the beginning of 5:18 identifies the object of the interjection (“Woe!”); therefore the preposition “to” is added to the translation (see also 6:1). Those addressed are a group of people that longs for the “Day of the Lord.” The phrase the “Day of the Lord” is found fifteen times in the prophets (Joel 1:15; 2:1; 2:31; 3:14; Obad 15; Zeph 1:14 [2×]; Isa 13:6, 9; Jer 32:33; Ezek 7:10; 13:5), but this is its only occurrence in Amos. This future time period of divine intervention involves blessing (light) and judgment (darkness), but the predominant use of the phrase is in contexts of judgment, as here. See the discussion of the phrase “at that time” in 5:13.

The interrogative ἴνα τί usually has an “overtone of discontent, displeasure, and the like” (Mur, 270), as it does here. The text suggests that the Lord has lost patience with the people’s desire for the “Day of the Lord.” They think it must be a time of blessing and vindication for them, but instead, as the next clauses explicitly declare, it will be a terrible time of judgment and grief. It is best to understand that the καί (a LXX addition) introducing the last clause in the verse “highlights a logical contradiction with what precedes” (Mur, 281) and could thus be rendered “when, since.” There is no break in B at this

point, and the scribe connected this sentence with the preceding, using the added *καί* to smooth the transition to the last clause in the verse; in other words, why should the people want the “Day of the Lord” to come “when it is darkness and not light”?

Verses 19–20 continue to clarify what the “Day of the Lord” involves. The examples that follow in 5:19 are hypothetical (*ἐάν* and subjunctive verbs). The verse illustrates that death will be everywhere and inescapable for the Lord’s enemies in the “Day of the Lord.” The experience of the “Day of the Lord” will be like a “man” (*ἄνθρωπος*; the gender of this general word is defined by the following pronoun *αὐτοῦ*) who flees from a lion and is attacked by a bear; and then that person rushes into his house and is bitten by a snake. There is no place of safety or escape, not even with extreme effort to flee to the least dangerous place imaginable. Several uses of the article in 5:19 are “generic articles” (C & S, § 44). To flee “from the [presence] face of” in (*ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ λέοντος*) is a Hebrew idiom that I have rendered “from a lion” (idea of “away from,” Mur, 493).

In the LXX verse 20 is one “single, related, interrogative” (Stuart, 352; cf. Wolff, 253–254, n. e). The particle *οὐχί* at the beginning of the sentence indicates that the translator expects a positive answer to the rhetorical question. The verse repeats the contents of the last clause in 5:18 and adds a parallel statement for emphasis. The *καί* marks the coordinate relationship between the two clauses (Mur, 280). The four terms used in 5:20 for the concepts of light and darkness are often used together in various combinations. I have translated them differently primarily for literary variation. The word translated “blackness” (*γνόφος*) occurs twenty-seven times in the LXX, and it most often describes a manifestation of God (Exod 20:21; Deut 4:11) or the atmosphere in which he dwells (2 Kgdms 22:10; 3 Kgdms 8:53; 2 Chron 6:1; Ps 17:10; 96:2; see also Heb 12:18); it describes the “Day of the Lord” in Joel 2:2; Zeph 1:15; Isa 60:2; and Ezek 34:12). It is a later form of *δνός* (LSJ, 354), meaning “darkness, dusk, gloom” (LSJ, 441). The word translated “brightness” (*φέγγος*) occurs twenty-five times in the LXX and is used to describe the atmosphere around God (2 Kgdms 22:13; Hab 3:11; Ezek 1:4, 13, 27, 28), the sun (2 Kgdms 23:4), a manifestation or attribute of God (3 Macc 6:4; Hab 3:4; Ezek 10:4; 43:2), a brilliant flame of fire (Hos 7:6), and the light of stars (Joel 2:10; 3:15). The Greek idiom *οὐκ ἔχων* (“without, lacking”) emphasizes the total lack of light for Israel on the “Day of the Lord.”

The point of the passage is clear: The “Day of the Lord” is not something the readers should look forward to as the solution to their problems. The repetition in this passage emphasizes the message: the “Day of the Lord” offers them no hope at all.

Empty Ritual and Idolatry Will Result in Captivity (5:21–27) and There Should Be No Sense of Security (6:1–14), 5:21–6:14

This is the longest paragraph in B, containing 21 verses. It has two main parts, 5:21–27 and 6:1–14. In the first section of this large paragraph the Lord condemns the empty ritual and idolatry of Israel, which will issue in their deportation beyond Damascus. The second section deals with Israel's false security. The Lord is no subtler about his condemnation of their ritual in 5:21–27 than he was about their prospects for deliverance on the "Day of the Lord" in 5:18–20. The repetition of two parallel, first person perfect tense verbs at the beginning of 5:21 ("I hate, I reject") with no connector between them makes his condemnation of their "religious festivals" personal and emphatic. In this context the perfect tense indicates a settled state of renunciation and marks or emphasizes the verbs. The emphatic negation in the second clause (οὐ μὴ with aorist subjunctive; BDF, § 365; Smyth, § 2754–2755) adds to the intensity of the condemnation of their ritual and worship, "I will never savor [ὀσφραίνομαι] the sacrifices." The imagery behind this clause is that of a god savoring the smell of a sacrifice, which indicates that the sacrifice is accepted (1Kgds 26:19; see also Gen 8:21; Lev 26:31). In this passage the imagery is negative; the Lord refuses to savor the sacrifices at Israel's festal gatherings, indicating he does not accept them. The imagery of the gods smelling the sacrifices is found from the earliest time in Greek literature (*Il.* 8,48; 23,148; *Od.* 8,363; *Theog.* 557). The sacrifices producing the aroma should not be limited to "meat-offerings" as Brenton does in his translation (cf. Lev 2:2; Num 15:7).

The two parallel terms used for the religious festivals in 5:21 are both common in secular Greek, and in the LXX both refer to gatherings of people for some sort of religious festival (Spicq, 3:4–8, esp. 5; Mur, 201, 430). The first, "religious festival" (ἑορτή), is used about 120 times in the LXX and is often further defined by a genitive identifying the feast in view. The second, "festal gathering" (πανήγυρις), is used parallel to ἑορτή the four times it is used in LXX (Hos 2:11; 9:5; Ezek 46:11; cf. Heb 12:22); it is "a major gathering of people to celebrate a formal occasion" (Spicq, 3:5), and in secular Greek it might emphasize the number, universality, or diversity of the general or plenary assembly (Spicq, 3:4). Since all the great Greek national festivals were religious in character (Spicq, 3:7), this idea would also transfer naturally to the LXX contexts where the word appears. These two terms in 5:21 communicate the Lord's total rejection of the feasts of Israel's cult. In the next verse he totally rejects their sacrifices, also.

The causal relationship between verses 21 and 22 (διότι) is loose at best, and 5:22a contains the protasis and apodosis of a future more vivid condition

(Smyth, § 2321–2325). The second half of the verse (connected by καί) is another sentence reinforcing the conditional statement in the first part. The general word for “sacrifices” (θυσία), used here parallel to “whole-burnt-offerings,” could refer to “animal sacrifice” (so Mur, 264), but the more general use of it in the previous verse in B suggests it need not be limited to that here either (see Wevers, *Leviticus*, 484–487 on “Terms for Sacrifice”).

In 5:22b ἐπιβλέπω must mean to look upon “approvingly” (Mur, 212) or “to show respect for” (BDAG, 368). The noun σωτήριον is always plural when referring to “peace offerings” (TDNT, 7:1021–1024; Spicq, 3:356–357), with the single exception of some manuscripts in Amos 5:22 (agreeing with the MT; see textual notes). The plural form in B suggests that it would be understood to refer to “peace offerings” here. Perhaps σωτήριον refers to “peace offerings” in light of their “conjectured goal and work,” i.e., to be “a sacrifice of salvation [or] a sacrifice which brings salvation” (TDNT, 7:1022); however, the word could just as well signify “a sacrifice that celebrates salvation” (NIDOTTE, 4:141). The Lord has no more respect for these offerings than he does for the non-acceptable “whole-burnt-offerings” and “sacrifices,” mentioned in the first part of the verse, because the “peace offerings” are simply an “outward show” (ἐπιφανείας). In B this noun is apparently in apposition to the accusative plural noun “peace offerings.” The substantive ἐπιφανείας (12 × in the LXX) can mean either “act of appearing, manifesting oneself” or “outward show” in the LXX (Mur, 225). Although the connotation of the word is not necessarily negative (see 2 Kgdms 7:23; 2 Macc 2:21; 3:24; 5:4; 14:15; 12:22; 15:27; Spicq, 2:67), the language is pejorative in Amos 5:22, and the context suggests ostentatious “outward show.” The Lord has no respect for offerings that are ostentatious manifestations of the supposed grandeur and greatness of the people offering them. Thus, the Lord rejects Israel’s feasts (5:21) and offerings (5:22); in the next verse he rejects their music also.

The Lord’s aorist command in 5:23a (“take away from me the sound of your hymns”) suggests urgency and indicates the religious songs of the people were offensive to him. The accusations, which were second person plural in 5:21–22, are second person singular in 5:23 (as in the MT). This could be in order to address the community as a whole (see Deut 6:4), to address one individual, such as the priest (Wolff, 263; cf. Stuart, 352), or to confront each person directly and individually (Paul, 190). The Greek reader would probably understand the singular collectively and attribute it to literary variation. “Sound” (ἦχος) is used in the LXX for music (e.g., Dan 3:7, 10, 15), the “tumult” or “noise” of battle (1 Kgdms 14:19; Joel 3:14), the sound of the

waves of the sea (Ps 64:8; Jer 28:42), and the “howling” of owls (Isa 13:21). It is not a flattering word for describing the sound of their music to the Lord.

In 5:23b the Lord emphasizes the futility of Israel’s worship; he will not even listen to their “songs of praise” (ψαλμός) to him. The genitive “instrument” (ὀργάνων), modifying “songs of praise” is a genitive of source (“from your instruments”; it could be a gen. of production also, Wallace, 104–106). What one hears usually stands in the accusative as the object of the word ἀκούω, as is the case here (Smyth, § 1361–1366 and BDF, § 173, 416); by contrast the person being heard usually stands in the genitive.

The Lord’s rejection of Israel’s feasts (5:21), sacrifices (5:22), and worship (5:23) is complete and absolute. He emphasizes this total repudiation by anthropomorphic imagery: He will not “smell” the sacrifices at their feasts; he will not look upon (“respect”) their sacrifices in general; and he will not “listen” to their worship music. What he wants is clarified in a sharp contrast in 5:24.

The Lord wants social justice, and in 5:24 he repeats the key words used in Amos to represent that concept, κρίμα and δικαιοσύνη (see 5:7 and 6:12). This has been a repeated theme through chapter 5 (5:7, 15, 24). The future tense verb in the verse would probably be read as a simple future (“judgment will roll”), referring to the Lord’s judgment (NETS; Dines, 165). The other option is to read it as a jussive future or future used as an imperative like the MT (C & S, § 74; BDF, § 362; Smyth, § 1917; see for example Lev 19:20–22); but that is not necessary here. Furthermore, the Lord is the subject in 5:23b, and it is natural that he continues to be the one doing the action in 5:24. The Lord is also the one who brings social justice to the earth in 5:7 where the same two terms are used (κρίμα and δικαιοσύνη). The verb “roll” (κυλίω) only occurs here and in 2:13 in Amos, and in the passive voice it has the active sense of “roll” (LSJ, 1008; BDAG, 574). The verb suggests that “judgment” and “righteousness” will be abundant and consistent in Israel. Two images emphasize the measure of social justice the Lord will cause to exist on the earth. First, judgment will “roll as water,” picturing a continual stream of it. Second, and more suggestive, righteousness will roll “as an impassable wadi.” This imagery suggests a raging stream in a wadi in rainy season that tumbles down a hill and is impossible to pass over (ἄβατος; see Hatch, 17, and Arieti, 35, on this last image). Such imagery leaves no doubt that the Lord desires a perpetual practice of social justice (see also Mic 6:6–8). This degree of social justice seems impossible in this world, and the fact that the Lord is the one responsible for it suggests this passage should be understood to refer to the Lord’s “future/eschatological action” (Theocharous, 235). This understanding is further supported by the likelihood that the LXX translation is alluding to

Ezek 47:5. That eschatological passage also describes the stream that flows from the new temple in terms of impassable waters (47:3–5). Theocharous (229–240) develops the connection between these two texts.

Amos 5:25–27 addresses a new topic and forms a separate section in the large paragraph (5:21–6:14). In 5:25–27 in the LXX Israel's sins are traced back to their idolatry in the wilderness. These verses are especially important because they are quoted in Acts 7:42–43 and Damascus Document (CD) VIII 14–15 (see also VII 16–20).

Although the historical context of the “forty years” in 5:25 is debatable in some LXX mss, which do not include the phrase “in the wilderness” (see the discussion in Dines, 165–166), in B the context is clearly the desert period after the Exodus from Egypt (see also 2:10). The rhetorical question in verse 25 anticipates a negative answer (introduced with the particle μή). Israel (here probably to be taken inclusively) did not offer sacrifices to the Lord during the forty years in the wilderness, which the LXX seems to portray in a negative light. The word rendered “sacrificial victims” (σφαγίλα) emphasizes the bloody nature and slaughter of the sacrifices referred to (Mur, 542; LSJ, 1737; Ezek 21:15, 20, 33). The sin and idolatry in 5:26 is connected with the events in 5:25 by a καὶ at the beginning of 5:26 and an aorist indicative verb “and you took up,” coordinate with “you did not offer” in 5:25, giving the impression that the idolatry in 5:26 replaced the sacrifices that were not offered according to 5:25 (Dines, 167). Thus 5:26 continues to describe Israel's activities in the wilderness for forty years and not a more contemporary situation in the northern kingdom of Israel (as MT).

According to Amos 5:26 Israel carried images of “Moloch” and “Raiphan” with them in the wilderness. A sacred tent shrine fits well with a desert setting, and here the “tent of Moloch” seems to refer to the tabernacle, which Israel carried around in the wilderness, professing to worship Yahweh but instead worshipping Moloch. (See Glenny, 136 on the rendering “tent of Moloch” in LXX-Amos 5:26.) The worship of Moloch, which involved child sacrifice, was especially abhorrent (4 Kgdms 23:10; Jer 39[32 MT]:35). The Rabbis described Moloch as “an image of brass, having the face of a calf, his hands open like one ready to receive something brought him from another” (Lightfoot, 4:85). This description is similar to the description of Saturn of Carthage in Diodorus Siculus (Book xx, ch. 1), “Among the Carthaginians there was an image of Saturn made of brass, putting forth the palms of his hands bending toward the earth, so that a child being put into them rolled off and fell into a great furnace of fire.” The second god mentioned, “Raiphan,” is more difficult to identify. Raiphan is defined as “your god,” leaving no doubt about their worship of it. Dines (168) comments that “the wide variety of manuscript renderings of the

name points to the uncertainty of the identification.” The phrase “the star of your god” preceding this appellation leaves little doubt that Raiphan refers to an astral deity. The Torah prohibited worship of the stars (Deut 4:19; 17:2–5). Images “of them,” clarifies in the Greek translation that the images are of Moloch and Raiphan. The Greek word used for images in the LXX (τύπος) only occurs elsewhere in the LXX three times (3 Macc 3:30, denoting the “form” of a letter; 4 Macc 6:19, where Eleazer will not be a “model” of impiety; and Exod 25:40, the “pattern” for the tabernacle revealed to Moses). Τύπος is a common word for “statue” or “image” in secular Greek, and here the word “suggests that these images were prototypes for subsequent idols” (Dines, 169; see also Spicq, 3:384–387).

Thus, LXX 5:26 continues the description of Israel’s sin in the wilderness that was started in 5:25. The verse describes some of the cult objects that they carried about in the wilderness: the tent shrine that housed Moloch, apparently a reference to the tabernacle itself, and the star that represented Raiphan, the star god. They also bore images of these two gods with them. The phrase “which you made for yourselves” emphasizes that these gods were nothing more than the creation of the people (see the discussion on the similar phrase in 2:4). The worship of stars was connected with worship of Moloch in the history of both the northern tribes (4 Kgdms 17:16, 17) and the southern tribes (4 Kgdms 23:5, 10, 24; cf. also Ezek 20 in the MT). The use of Amos 5:25–27 (LXX) in Stephen’s speech in Acts 7 connects these two gods, suggesting they are both astral deities (7:42) and also connecting the worship of these gods with the worship of the golden calf (7:41). Stephen’s argument in Acts 7 makes the sins described in Amos 5:25–26 proto-typical of Israel’s sins as a nation throughout their history. In the Damascus Document (CD VII 13–19) Amos 5:26–27 becomes part of a promise of salvation, with no references to pagan deities. In the detailed exposition of the text in CD VII 15b–19a “the booth of the king” (interpreted by Amos 9:11) is said to mean the books of the Torah, the “king” is equated with the congregation, “the bases of the images” are the books of the prophets, and the “star” is the one who interprets the Torah, understood in light of Numbers 24:17 (see Wolff, 266–267; Park, 179–188). The Qumran interpretation of the passage is unique, describing the historical genesis of the Qumran sect and applying the text to the community’s sectarian interests.

As Dines concludes (169), the most important aspect of the translation of Amos 5:25–27 in the LXX is not the names of the gods but “the option for a past tense in ἀνελάβετε.” The use of the aorist tense does not necessitate a past time for this verb, but, as described above, the context of the forty years in the wilderness and the use of the passage by Stephen show that the verb

was understood that way. Thus, the context of verse 26 is the desert period, and in Acts 7 Stephen connects it with the golden calf.

The καὶ at the beginning of 5:27 introduces the consequence of the sins described in the previous context; that consequence is captivity, thus indicating that the sins of Israel in the wilderness in verses 25–26 are meant to be understood to be prototypical of their sins throughout their history, as they are in Acts 7. The subject is now the Lord, who will lead his people away captive in fulfillment of the covenant curse in Deut 29:28. “Beyond Damascus” recalls Deut 30:4, and the readers of the LXX would probably have identified this with captivity in Babylon. It is noteworthy that in Acts 7 it is changed to “beyond Babylon,” referring to the captivity of the southern kingdom. The validity of this prophecy is affirmed with the oath-like confirmation formula “says the Lord; his name is the God, the Almighty One.” This exact name for God recurs four times in the LXX, all in Amos (see 4:13; 5:8; 9:6), although in this instance it is complicated a bit by the accompanying verb “says.” This context promises no deliverance for Israel on the Day of the Lord; in fact, they will be judged for their sins and the Lord will lead them into captivity far to the north, “beyond Damascus.” There will be no escape, for the almighty, true God, the Lord, has spoken it.

Amos 6:1–14 is another woe oracle (cf. 5:16, and esp. 5:18–20), which is placed in one large paragraph in B with 5:21–27. The first seven verses of the chapter address the false security, self-confidence, and self-indulgence of the nation, concluding (διὰ τοῦτο) with the announcement of their exile (6:7). The last seven verses contain the Lord’s oath that he will raise up a nation against the house of Israel that will take them into captivity.

In Amos 6:1 the LXX speaks of one group that despises Zion and trusts in the mountain of Samaria; the verse is “a condemnation of Zion’s enemies” (Dines, 177). Satterthwaite (23) comments, “In (let us say) the middle of the 2nd century BCE this Septuagint text might well have turned the hearers’ minds to thoughts of the Samaritans, who would not worship in Jerusalem, but had a temple at Mt. Gerizim.” Clearly the translation carries a “startling ideological payload” (Satterthwaite, 24). (See Glenn, 167–173; Dines, 178; and Satterthwaite, 24, on this verse.)

There is a clear example of polemic against Samaria in Sir 50:26, indicating an anti-Samaritan sentiment in the second century BCE (see ABD, 5:942). Of course the tension went back as far as the return of the exiles and the rebuilding of Jerusalem (2 Esd 4; 2 Esd 14). Dines (180) lists other possible people that the translator may have had in mind when he referred to those despising Jerusalem in 6:1, and several are possible in the larger context of the book (i.e., Israel, Hellenizers, liberal priests); but none fits the immediate

context as well as Samaritans (“those who trust in the mountain of Samaria”; so also Cripps, 202, n. 2). However, Samaritans do not fit well with the remainder of the verse.

The translator uses a third person aorist verb in 7:1b (“they have plucked”; see LSJ, 224 and Mur, 62, who translate it “pluck” and call this a metaphorical use of this verb; see also Park, 168; Dines, 181–183; Arieti, 60; and Glenny, 170). This is the only occurrence of this rare Greek verb (ἀποτρύγω) in the LXX, and the clause is difficult to interpret. The object of the Greek verb, “the heads of the nations” does not help make sense of the clause. Dines (184) suggests the clause may be related to the picture of opulence in 6:4–7 and have a conceptual background like Isa 65:5–7 where the wealth of the nations pours into Jerusalem. It is likely that those trusting in Samaria who have harvested the heads of the nations would bring to mind Seleucids, who had defeated some of the surrounding nations (see discussion of 6:2). The connection of Samaria with the Seleucids is well documented in the second century. Antiochus the Great captured the city in about 198 BCE (Josephus, *Ant.* 12.133) and it became a Hellenistic city, until the Maccabees captured it in 108/107 (see ABD, 5:93, 919; Josephus, *Ant.* 12.257–264). Thus in the second century “those who trust in the mountain of Samaria” and “scorn Mount Zion” are probably to be understood as a broader group than just the Samaritans. The remainder of the context suggests that in that period our translator would have in mind the Seleucid Hellenizers who controlled Samaria and those who sympathized with them.

The next clause, “they have entered in,” is equally obscure; the subject could be either the Seleucid Hellenizers who did the harvesting in the previous clause or the leaders of the nations, who were harvested. The personal pronoun (“they” in “they have entered in” in B), where none had been used previously in the verse, more naturally refers to the new group just introduced, “the heads of the nations.” Likely it refers to their entrance into the kingdom of the Seleucids. (If the Seleucids are the ones entering in, it could refer to the capture of Bethel by the army of the Seleucids [1 Macc 9:50] or to the fact that the Seleucids had entered into Judea or Jerusalem [cf. the use of the verb in 6:14].)

In the LXX “house of Israel” goes with verse 2 where it functions as a vocative of address. “All” of Israel is commanded to “cross over” to “see.” The following context suggests they are to pass over their border to another land to “see.” The translator certainly has some location in mind, perhaps Judah or even Samaria, because “from there” they are to “pass through” to “Emath Rabba” (Hamath), a city in central Syria that was the idealized northern border of Israel (3 Kgdms 8:65; 1 Chron 13:5; Amos 6:14), and they are to “go

down from there to Geth of the Philistines,” a city not mentioned in the judgment oracle against Philistia in 1:6–8. These cities are “the best out of all of these kingdoms,” and like Israel they no longer have borders, as the following rhetorical question suggests (“Are their borders greater than your borders?”). The reader of the LXX likely understood the borders connected with Emath Rabba to be the northern borders of Israel. The conditional particle (εἰ) introduces an indirect question in the last clause (so Mur, 145), and the punctuation in B indicates a break before the last clause, supporting such an understanding of that clause. (NETS has “See if their borders are greater than your borders.”)

Verse 3 begins a string of participles continuing through verse 6, which could be a further description of the “house of Israel” addressed in verse 2 (i.e., “You are approaching”). However, the context makes more sense if the subject of the participles agrees with the third person verbs in 6:5b, 6b, and 7a, and thus they are the same people addressed in 6:1 (i.e. “They are approaching”). They are approaching a “bad day” in the sense that it is a day of misfortune, misery, and calamity (Mur, 284). The following participles seem to give the reason that this day is “bad” for them. The two participles, “drawing near and adopting,” are a doublet, i.e., both translate the same Hebrew verb (Arieti, 44; Johnson, 34); the verb “adopt” (ἐφάπτομαι) could mean “hold fast” (9:5; NETS), “apply oneself to” (Mur, 242), “take hold of, touch, possess” (LSJ, 741), or “participate in” (Dines, 186). I have rendered it “adopt” (as Brenton), implying more than mere participation in, but rather the acceptance of “false Sabbaths.” Dines (187, n. 15) suggests that the Sabbaths are “false” (ψευδῶν) in the sense that they are “deceptive” or “giving false security,” and thus, they are worthless and of no value (Mur, 604). “False Sabbaths” could refer to practices like the syncretistic worship of the Samaritans described in Josephus (*Ant* 12.257–264) or the profanation of the Sabbath in 1 Macc 1:43. The Sabbath was a key marker of Jewish identity and Law-keeping in the intertestamental period.

Verses 4–6 describe the affluent and luxurious lifestyle of the subjects. The first aspect of their lives that is addressed is their furniture: they “sleep upon ivory beds.” The next participial phrase, “behave lewdly upon their couches,” is very suggestive. The verb (κατασπατάλω) only occurs twice in the LXX (see Prov 29:21: “He who lives wantonly”) and rarely in secular Greek. LSJ (91) suggests the meaning “live wantonly,” which has the connotation of a lack of restraint, especially in sexual behavior; Dines (187) gives it a similar idea, translating it “act dissolutely”; NETS has “live lewdly.” Brenton’s “live delicately” and Muraoka’s “live in excessive comfort” are too tame for this word and context. The Targum has “there are stains upon their couches.”

The Talmud (*b. Shab*, 62b) understands Amos 6:4 to describe “people who eat and drink together, join their couches, exchange their wives, and make their couches foul with semen that is not theirs” (see Jastrow, 1025). The Christian commentators also emphasize sexual promiscuity in the passage, perhaps reflecting the Jewish exegesis of it (Dines, 187, n. 18). The word “couch” (στρωμνή) refers to a spread or prepared bed (Mur, 525; LSJ, 1656) or the covering for the bed (Esth 1:6). It is often used in the LXX for a “bed” or “couch” without sexual connotations, but it can also have such (Gen 49:4). The verb “behave lewdly,” combined with a “couch” or “prepared bed,” implies sexual promiscuity in the LXX translation.

The third present participle in the verse, “eating,” introduces the sumptuous menu of the subjects. The text focuses on their meat, which was a food of the rich and only eaten a few times a year by most. The term γαλαθηνά (“suckling”) emphasizes the youth of the calves they are eating.

Verse 5 moves to a description of the music of the rich, who “clap” or “beat time” (Mur, 217; LSJ, 641; NETS has “applaud”) to the sound of their instruments. Then in the second half of the verse the participial sequence of 6:3–5a is interrupted with a main verb that signals a parenthesis before the participial sequence begins again in 6:6. The adverb ὥς (2 × in 6:5) is not used to show comparison; it is translated “to be” here; it “shifts from the notion of similarity to identity” (Mur, 611) and gives “the perspective from which something is to be viewed or understood” (BDAG, 1104).

Two issues complicate the meaning of 6:5b: first, the two accusative participles could be masculine singular or neuter plural. This issue is important because if the participles are masculine singular they refer to a person (perhaps a leader or despot) who is (mistakenly?) considered to be established and not fleeing, whereas if they are neuter plural they refer to things, apparently the pleasures that the rich are enjoying, which they mistakenly think are permanent. The context of this parenthetical comment suggests that the participles are referring to the fleeting pleasures of the rich (so Brenton and Mur, 582).

The second issue is that the participle φεύγοντα normally means to flee or run away from an undesirable situation (Mur, 582), and here it seems to mean “fleeting” or “ephemeral,” as opposed to permanent. Dines (188–193) goes into great detail studying the usage of the second participle (φεύγω) in Greek literature and concludes that there is no clear example of the word used to refer to the fleeting or ephemeral (although Jerome takes it this way, Dines, 192). Two facts suggest that the two participles here refer to the literal standing or establishing and then the fleeing (as in a rout) of a person. First, the two verbs in 6:5b (φεύγω and ἵστημι) are often used with these

meanings (they are used together in Jer 26:21; 31:19; and Nah 2:8). Second, in light of the normal use of these verbs, why would the translator choose the verb *φεύγω* if he had a different idea in mind? However, in response to this view, he may have used *φεύγω* because there were not many other words to choose from. Louw and Nida list no entries for ephemeral, short-lived, transient, passing, fleeting, or brief, and of the words that Woodhouse lists for Greek definitions of “ephemeral” and “short-lived” only one occurs in the LXX one time (*ὀλιγοχρόνιος* in Wis 9:5). Another problem with taking *φεύγω* as referring to the literal fleeing of a person from a difficult situation in Amos 6:5 is that the reader has no idea of the identity of the one who is established or permanent and not fleeing.

Furthermore, there are several uses of this verb (*φεύγω*) that are very close to the metaphorical meaning “fleeting” or “ephemeral.” In Jer 26:15[46:15 MT] the verb *φεύγω* is parallel to *οὐκ ἔμεινεν*; thus to flee means not to remain, and *φεύγω* has a sense of transitory or ephemeral. Several times it has the idea of “vanish, disappear” (BDAG, 1052), many times combined with the phrase *ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ* (Ps 67:2; Deut 28:7; Josh 8:5). Perhaps the best example of *φεύγω* meaning “vanish, disappear” is in the phrase “and every island fled away,” which is parallel to “and the mountains were not found” in Rev 16:20. This passage combines the ideas of “flee,” “vanish,” and “ephemeral.” In fact the parallel clause, “and the mountains were not found,” suggests the metaphorical use of “fleeting (as against permanent)” suggested by Muraoka for Amos 6:5. Louw and Nida (1:160; see also 1:278) give “to cease rapidly to exist” as a possible meaning of the verb in Rev 16:20. Therefore, I am not as pessimistic as Dines about the possibility of *φεύγω* having a figurative sense of fleeting and ephemeral as opposed to permanent, and in the context of Amos 6:5 this understanding of the verb is most natural. Amos 6:5b apparently refers to the fleeting pleasures (present participle) of the rich that they think are abiding and permanent (perfect participle).

Verse 6 returns to the participial sequence of 6:3–5a to describe further the extravagance and intemperance of the rich in Israel. They drink “strained wine” that is thus purified and refined, apparently referring to their excessive high standards. Theocharous (146–150) has a good discussion of wine drinking in the Greek and Roman worlds. She concludes that by his use of the phrase “strained wine,” the translator “meant to suggest that an elite group of people indulged in the best quality of wine, a kind which encouraged more consumption than would unfiltered wine” (150). The next phrase continues this theme, describing the “finest ointment” they use to anoint themselves. The verse concludes with another indicative verb, serving as a parenthetical summary (see 6:5b) and transitioning to the announcement of judgment

in 6:7. They were so wrapped up in their wealth and pleasures that the rich were not suffering in any way over “the destruction of Ioseph” (cf. 5:6 and 15; “Ioseph” refers to Israel or the ten northern tribes, Zech 10:6). “The destruction of Ioseph” apparently refers to the fall of Israel and their captivity in Assyria (see 5:6, 16). The word translated “destruction” (συντριβή) often refers to a state of ruin resulting from a calamity or disaster (Prov 14:28; 17:16; Nah 3:19; Lam 2:13; 3:47), and that could be the sense of it for the reader of the LXX.

Verse 7 concludes (διὰ τοῦτο) the unit of 6:1–7 with the announcement of judgment in the form of exile. In this context νῦν may introduce the opposite of what might have been (LSJ, 1185). The description of the captivity in this verse is difficult to interpret. There are two especially difficult phrases. Dines (196–197) gives four possible ways to understand the phrase “from among the head of princes.” Two seem most likely in this context. If it is translated “from among the head of princes,” ἀπό with the genitive has a partitive force, and ἀρχή has the sense of “head, ruler.” The phrase then means captives will be taken from among the chief leaders or princes. If it is translated “away from the rule of princes,” the preposition has the idea of “removal or dislocation” (Mur, 49–50) and ἀρχη refers to “rule, sovereignty” (as in Herodotus, *Hist.* 3.80; 4.147) and is a subjective genitive; thus, the phrase refers to being taken into captivity and removed from the princes’ or leaders’ rule. Either understanding could work in this context, but the first seems to fit better with the emphasis on the bringing down of rulers in the last part of the verse. Thus, the royal class or rulers will go into captivity. Another possible interpretation of 6:7a, not mentioned by Dines, is to take ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς temporally (“from the beginning”), which is its normal idea in the LXX (so NETS). The problem with this rendering is that it does not make any apparent sense in the captivity announcement in 6:7a.

The last part of the verse, “the neighing of horses will be removed from Ephraim,” is apparently related to the captivity (see Glenny, 171–173 on this clause). The meaning of this clause is also difficult to determine (see Dines, 197–199). The horses (see 4:10; 6:12) apparently represent power and military might, and in Scripture horses are often a picture of self-reliance and lack of trust in God (Deut 17:16; Ps 32[33 MT]:17; Isa 2:7; Hos 14:4; Mic 5:10; and Zech 9:10). Seeligmann (78) suggests that behind this verse and Isa 28:2–3 is a lost tradition concerning the destruction of the army of Ephraim, which resulted in breathing space for the land. Zech 9:10 is also important for Amos 6:7, because in that verse the LXX speaks in the third person of a royal figure, “He will destroy the chariots from Ephraim and the horse out of Jerusalem.” Van der Kooij (“The Septuagint of Zechariah,” 62) suggests that the royal figure in LXX-Zechariah 9:10, who will deliver Israel from their enemies, “fits the pic-

ture of Maccabean leaders as presented in 1 Macc. This applies in particular to Simon, because he is depicted as the leader who saved Israel from the enemies in the land, including the occupants of the citadel in Jerusalem" (see 1 Macc 13–14; esp. 14:36). Horses are also a figure for lustful behavior in biblical literature (Jer 5:8; 13:27; Ezek 23:20; Songs 1:11; and Amos 6:12; 1 *En.* 86:4), but this idea does not fit well in this context. Verses 1, 3, and 6:6b suggest that the referents in 6:1–7 extend beyond the "Israel" in 6:2, which fact is consistent with a reference to the removal of Syrian armies from Ephraim in 6:7b. In fact, the continual reference to parties that go beyond Israel in 6:1–7 (including possibly all of 6:3–7) suggests that in the LXX this section is describing those in 6:1 who "scorn Mount Zion and ... trust in the mountain of Samaria" (see discussion of them in 6:1). This means that the "they" who are "captives" in 6:7a is not a reference to Israel in 722 BCE, but rather a reference to those addressed in 6:1, who could be Seleucids, Hellenized Jews, or even Hellenistic sympathizers.

Amos 6:8–14 contains the Lord's oath against Jacob. See the discussion of oaths in 2:4, 6:8, and 14. The conjunction $\delta\tau\iota$ at the beginning of 6:8 indicates that the following explains or supports 6:7, and $\delta\iota\acute{o}\tau\iota$ introduces the content of the oath (as in the oath formula in 4:2) by giving the reason for it ("because I myself loathe") which is followed by the content of the oath ("therefore, I will remove"). The reason for the oath is stated in strong language, which turns the attitudes of the people back on themselves. In 5:10 the leaders of Israel are described as those who "hated him who reproves in the gateways ... and loathed pious speech"; now using the same verbs it is the Lord who loathes "all [their] arrogance" and "hates" their "regions" (lit. administrative districts [$\chi\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha$]). The reference to "all" and "regions" allows the application of this oath to be broad. The last clause in the verse gives the result of all this, and I have translated the $\kappa\alpha\iota$ as "therefore" to bring out the sense. The Lord will remove "a city," another indefinite reference that could have broad application. The following dative phrase, "with all of those inhabiting it," is awkward and is probably best understood as a dative of association or accompaniment (Wallace, 159–160; see Smyth, § 1521–1524 on the comitative dative). The phrase emphasizes that all the inhabitants of the city will be part of the deportation.

The story portrays a desperate situation, apparently for those who are left after the deportation into captivity (6:6). The hypothetical situation presented is probably meant to illustrate the total destruction of the city in 6:8. The words $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ are commonly used to "introduce an utterance indicating what may or ought to happen" (Mur, 282 and 148). Verses 9–10 are a more vivid future conditional sentence (Smyth, § 2323–2328). The story is presented as an open possibility at some indefinite future time that is used to

support the argument of the passage. The protasis of the condition is the first clause, and it is hard to know exactly where the apodosis ends, but perhaps it continues through the string of futures in verses 9–10 (see similar conditional constructions in 7:2 and Zech 13:3). Verse 11 is apparently a summary and explanation of verses 9–11, and the *διότι* at the beginning of it is causal. The condition presented is that ten men survive in one “household” or “family” (Mur, 399; the word is *οἰκία*, only here and in 6:10 in Amos); this seems like a large number of survivors, and it suggests an extended family perhaps living together in a palatial mansion (cf. 6:10). The point is that even if such a large number of people “are left in one household,” “then” (the *καὶ* introduces the apodosis, Mur, 281) they will die. The verb (*ὑπολείπω*) only occurs four times in Amos (5:3–2 × and 6:9–2 ×), and it suggests that the ones “left” represent the remnant of Israel. This verse builds on 5:3 and the statement that if a hundred went out to war only ten would be left. Here it appears that even those ten die. At this point the LXX adds another future tense clause in the extended apodosis, using the verb *ὑπολείπω* for the second time in the verse, “but the survivors will be left.” Apparently the translator felt that this addition was necessary to explain the family members who bury the corpses in 6:10, and thus, he introduces a new group of people.

The apodosis continues in verse 10 with more future tense verbs. “Their kinsmen” (*οἱ οἰκεῖοι οἱ αὐτῶν*; so Mur, 398), who “take” the dead (“them”), are apparently the “survivors” of the original remnant in 6:9. The ones who take up the bodies “will endeavor to carry away their bones out of the house.” “House” is *οἶκος*, apparently to distinguish it from the “household” (*οἰκία*) twice elsewhere in 6:9–10.

The Greek term *παραβιάζονται* (“they will endeavor” from *παραβιάζομαι*) is difficult; it is a strong word suggesting the use of violence or force (LSJ, 1305), and it could have the sense of the middle or active voice here (see the detailed discussion on this phrase in Dines, 200–206). It is transitive four of the seven times it occurs in the LXX (Gen 19:9; 1 Kgdms 28:23; 4 Kgdms 2:17; 5:16); in transitive constructions this word family usually means to constrain the object of the verb. The construction in Amos 6:10 (with an articular genitive infinitive completing it) is parallel to Jonah 1:13 (Mur, 432), where it has the idea of “endeavor, strive” (cf. also 4 Kgdms 5:16, which has an infinitive with the direct object to complete the sense). This parallel construction is the only other use of this verb in the Twelve. The verb could possibly also have the idea of “insist” in Amos 6:10, but that meaning is more common in the LXX for the verb without the prepositional prefix (*βιάζομαι*), and it suggests that someone is resisting the efforts; Dines (205) observes that this would involve an extension of the range of meaning of *παραβιάζομαι*. The

translation adopted here (“endeavor, strive”) suggests the use of force and perhaps struggle “to carry away their bones out of the house.” The “bones” refer to a corpse (Mur, 419). However, it is not clear why they would need to “endeavor” to do this. What is the difficulty involved? The answer may be in the last part of the verse, which suggests there is some danger involved in this situation and people must even be careful of what they say lest they incur the anger of the Lord. The context suggests a plague or curse on the house.

The singular *ēpeî* (3 × in 6:10b) should be taken to mean, “someone will say,” and it is apparently used of two indefinite speakers, who are conversing in this verse (Dines, 207; Brenton). Since the last occurrence of this verb apparently has the same subject as the first, I have translated it “he says.” The indefinite speaker addresses one of the leaders or “heads of the household” (see Dines, 207–208 for other possible explanations of this phrase). How far the direct speech continues in the last statement is not clear; it seems most natural to take all the words in the verse after the command “Be silent” as a continuation of that statement (so also Dines, 200). In the first statement the conditional particle *ei* introduces a direct question (see 6:12; Mur, 145).

The “heads of the household” must be among “the survivors” who are left according to 6:9. An anonymous speaker asks “the heads” if anyone remains “with you” (sing.), apparently addressing one specific individual. The anonymous responder who answers the question is apparently the individual addressed in the first question. This person answers, “Not any longer” (Mur, 422), and apparently the first anonymous speaker responds with the command “Be silent” and the explanation following the command, “so as not to name the name of the Lord.”

But why such a command and prohibition and what could it mean? “To name the name of the Lord” is used in several different contexts in the Old Testament. In Jer 20:9 Jeremiah protests that he will no longer “name the name of the Lord,” and it is parallel to speaking in the name of the Lord. There the phrase means to invoke the Lord as part of the prophetic vocation. Isa 26:13 (“we will name your name”) is similar; there the phrase means to worship and depend on the Lord in the LXX, which differs from the prayer of repentance for idolatry in the MT. In Josh 23:7 to name the names of the Canaanite gods is connected with idolatry. In the blasphemy trial in Lev 24:10–23 to “name the name of the Lord” is to curse, and it results in death (esp. 24:11, 15–16). This last sense of blaspheming the Lord’s name could be what the phrase is referring to in Amos 6:10. However, Jer 51[44 MT]:24–30 provides an even closer parallel. In that context the Jewish exiles in Egypt (esp. women 51[44 MT]:24–25) who have promised to fulfill their vows to

the Queen of Heaven are told not to name the name of the Lord anymore (saying, “as the Lord lives”), because the Lord was going to destroy them. This passage is very similar to Amos 8:14, where the Lord condemns the same kind of syncretistic invocations. Therefore, it is likely that the reason for the prohibition to “name the name of the Lord” in 6:10 was because the worship involved was syncretistic and involved the application of sacred invocations to other gods. Such blasphemy resulted in judgment.

The conjunction διότι at the beginning of verse 11 is a loose causal connector (Mur, 129), indicating that the following tells why what was just stated can be considered valid (BDAG, 251). When the Lord commands, both the great and the little house will be judged. The “great” and “little” language is more than a merism here. “House” (οἶκος) seems to refer to a household (of people), rather than a building or structure, contrary to its employment in 6:10. (The word οἰκία was used for a household or the people in a house in 6:9 and 10.) The language “he will strike the ... house with bruises and ... with lacerations” (physical punishments) highlights the severity of the judgment and requires that the reference be to a household (perhaps even family or dynasty) and not a building. This is the only occurrence of θλάσμα (here “bruises”) and ῥάγμα (here “lacerations”) in the LXX, although the first is also found in secular literature (LSJ, 802) and the second is likely an alternative Hellenistic spelling for ῥήγμα (C & S, § 9b; Dines, 211, n. 40). If this is a correct analysis of ῥάγμα, it could refer to a rend or a breakage in a building or a human body (LSJ, 1568). Since οἶκος (27× in Amos) is used thirteen times in the book to refer to the house of Israel, Judah, Joseph, or Jeroboam with the idea of the descendants of a prominent ancestor in the sense of a dynasty or kingdom (3:1, 13; 5:1, 3, 6, 25; 6:1, 14; 7:9, 10, 16; 9:8, 9), it is very likely that such a sense is implied here with the switch in the judgment language from judgment on a structure or building (MT) to judgment on people (LXX). It is noteworthy that οἰκία in the LXX does not have this sense of dynasty or descendants of a prominent ancestor, and the use of οἶκος here, where one would expect οἰκία with the more physical judgments on humans, is a further signal that the judgment is a figurative description of judgment on dynasties or kingdoms. It appears that the translator is referring to the destruction of the northern and southern kingdoms in Israel.

Amos 6:12–14 continues the theme of Israel’s defeat from 6:8–11. In these verses, which conclude this long paragraph, the LXX uses two absurdities from the natural realm to demonstrate the absurdity and inappropriateness of Israel’s behavior, values, and beliefs. The last verse is another prediction of Israel’s oppression and occupation by an enemy. The particle εἰ introduces the two direct rhetorical questions (cf. 3:3–8) at the beginning of 6:12 that

present absurd situations intended to provoke. The implied answer to the first question is obvious, horses do not “pursue eagerly” (Mur, 131) or “gallop” (Dines, 211) on rocks or they will break their legs and fall. They cannot run in such situations, and to do so would be folly and insanity. The second question is another good example of the absurd; stallions do not refrain from neighing in the presence of mares! (See the reference to horses in 6:7.)

The remainder of the verse addresses some of the absurd deeds of the Israelites. They “have perverted judgment into wrath and the fruit of righteousness into bitterness.” The people of Israel are behaving as strangely as a horse that runs on the rocks or a stallion that does not neigh in the presence of mares. The two terms, “wrath” and “bitterness,” are only found here in LXX-Amos, and they suggest the deep feelings and emotions of those who are oppressing the poor and unjust. For more details on their injustice and unrighteousness see 2:6–8; 3:9–10; 4:1; 5:10–15, 21–24. What is clear in this verse is that Israel’s perverse behavior upsets the generally accepted world order in a way animals would not upset the order in their realms (see the oracles of judgment on the nations in chapters 1–2 for other examples of behavior that violates the most basic standards and rules of the human race).

Verse 13 is only loosely connected grammatically with the preceding. The two attributive participles in verse 13 derive their subject from the second person plural verb in 6:12, “you have perverted.” The thematic connection between verses 12 and 13 is the presentation of another absurdity in 6:13, the foolish pride the nation has in their military prowess. Their pride is foolish because they have not really accomplished anything (6:13a). In the LXX οὐδενὶ λόγῳ (“what amounts to nothing”) is a cynical reference to the matter under discussion (Park, 167; Mur, 349). The original readers of the LXX would probably have understood “horns” in 6:13b as a figure for power, status, or military might.

The conjunction διότι at the beginning of verse 14 is inferential (“therefore”; cf. 6:11), concluding the section and explaining what the preceding means for Israel. The Lord of hosts, who controls the nations, will raise up (future present) an unidentified nation against Israel that will oppress them (see 3:11). The name for the Lord in B (κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων) emphasizes his power over all the nations and how far it exceeds that of Israel (6:13). The result or consequence of the oppression by this undesignated nation is expressed with a genitive articular infinitive (C & S, § 60) in the last part of the verse (“so that you will not enter into Emath and as far as the wadi (river) of the west”). In the LXX rendering in Amos 6:14b the Lord raises up a nation to oppress Israel so the people cannot enter in to Hamath at the north of their land (see 6:2)

until the Wadi of the West (or the setting of the sun), which is apparently on the western border of the land by Egypt. The LXX describes the oppression from the perspective of one outside of the land, who cannot enter into any part of it from the north to the border of Egypt, approximating the borders before the kingdoms were divided. The translation of 6:14 is especially apt for readers who are in Egypt and not able to return to Jerusalem because a foreign power (Syria?) controls and oppresses the people in Israel.

The long paragraph, 5:21–6:14, begins with charges against Israel (5:21–23) and a promise that judgment and righteousness will abound in the future (5:24). Then because of Israel's sins in the wilderness, which are paradigmatic of their later sins, the Lord announces that they will be deported beyond Damascus (5:25–27). The objects of the Lord's judgment are broadened in 6:1–7 to include those who despise Zion and trust in Samaria, apparently Seleucid sympathizers or Samaritans (note esp. “false Sabbaths” in 6:3). Finally, in 6:8–14 judgment is decreed on Israel (6:14) for their pride and injustice, and as a result they will not be allowed to enter their land.

Vision of Locusts and the Lord's Mercy, 7:1–3

Amos 7:1–3 is the first of five visions in the book (cf. 7:4–6; 7:7–9; 8:1–3; and 9:1–4). The first two visions are similar in theme (the prophet is interceding with the Lord for Israel in order to avoid a catastrophe) and vocabulary (compare esp. 7:2b–3 with 7:5–6; see Glenny, 58, n. 91). In both visions Amos intercedes because Israel does not realize its vulnerability and weakness (ὄτι ὀλιγοστός ἐστίν, 7:2, 5). The first vision is a plague of locusts led by “Gog the King”; Amos pleads for mercy and the Lord relents concerning this judgment.

The translation of Amos 7:1 has been the subject of much discussion (see Gelston, 497–498; Dines, 213–221; Park, 157; Bruce, 18–21; Glenny, 91–93; 139–140; 202–207; Glenny, “Hebrew Misreadings,” 539–540). In this first vision Amos sees “a swarm of locusts coming at dawn.” The basic idea of ἐπιγονή is “offspring” when applied to living things (LSJ, 628; Mur, 213), and it has the nuance “plentiful” in this context (Dines, 213; see 7:2); thus, when applied to “locusts” it is translated “swarm.” The adjective ἐωθινός can function as an adverb (LSJ, 751; 1 Macc 5:30 where it is dative), but here it agrees with ἐπιγονή and functions as an adjective (NETS; cf. Dines, 213–214). It could mean “getting into action early in the morning” or “from the east.” It normally has the former idea (LSJ, 751; Mur, 244). Many of the contexts in which this adjective is used in the LXX (8×) indicate that daybreak “is the time for deliverance from enemies” (see esp. Ps 21[22 MT]: 1; also Exod 14:24; Jud 12:5; 1 Kgdms 11:11; 1 Macc 5:30), although in some passages where it occurs disaster

strikes at the very time that one would have expected deliverance (Dines, 214; Jonah 4:7), and that seems to be the case in Amos 7:1.

In the second clause in 7:1 (“and behold one locust [grub] was Gog the king”) the word βροῦχος, which can refer to the “locust grub” or the “wingless larva” of the locust (LSJ, 331), is an especially demeaning description of an enemy of Israel. The rendering “Gog” here is especially noteworthy also, because of its eschatological implications (and because it is a change from the Hebrew).

In order to try to understand the translator’s motivation and meaning in the reference to Gog it is helpful to summarize references to Gog elsewhere in Scripture. Most of the references to Gog in the MT are in Ezek 38–39 (9×; see Hamon Gog in 39:11 and 15; Magog in 38:2 and 39:6; a personal descendant of Reuben is named Gog in 1Chron 5:4). There is no locust imagery in Ezek. The LXX has a few more references to Gog in Ezek 38–39 than the MT (38:17 and 39:6 [MT has Magog], 15 [MT has Hamon Gog]). It also has references to Gog in Num 24:7 and Amos 7:1. In Balaam’s prophecy in Num 24:7 the translator apparently updates “Agag,” the Amalekite king, changing the name to “Gog” (see Bruce, 20–21; Wevers, *Numbers*, 405–406, 13; and Dines, 215–216). Num 24:7 in the LXX describes “a man” who will come forth from the seed of “Jacob” (24:5), who will rule over many nations, and whose kingdom will be more exalted than Gog. The “man” is apparently the same “man” described in 24:17 (for MT’s “scepter”), who is also a “star out of Jacob” and will defeat the gentiles. Since the translation of Num is commonly placed in the third century BCE, the LXX version of Num 24 gives evidence of an earlier strand of the Gog tradition than Amos, which emphasizes at this early stage “the eschatological and transcendent dimension of messianism” (Lust, “Messianism,” 177, n. 15). Thus, LXX-Num refers to a son of David who is expected to restore his great ancestor’s fortunes (Bruce, 20). It is also noteworthy that B has “Gog” in original readings in Deut 3:1, 13; 4:47; and Sir 48:17 (Dines, 217; Bruce 20–21); the last passage connects Gog and Hezekiah, perhaps seeing Sennacherib as a fulfillment of the Gog prophecy. There are references to Gog also in *Sib. Or.* 3:313 and 512 (2nd century BCE in Egypt; Charlesworth, 1:355); in the first passage Gog and Magog are placed in Ethiopia, perhaps because of the association of Gog with Cush in Ezek 38:5 and/or because this section of the work was produced in Egypt. These references give evidence of a Gog tradition in Egypt in the second century BCE (cf. Sir 48:17 from the second century in Palestine). See also 1QM XI 1–XII 15 in which the Qumran writers identify Gog with Israel’s final gentile oppressor, the Kittim.

How then is Gog connected with the locusts in Amos 7:1? Amos 4:9 describes a caterpillar plague, but that does not seem to be in the translator’s

mind in 7:1. Bruce (18–19) suggests that the connecting link between Gog and the locusts of Amos 7:1 is Joel's vision; if Joel's locusts were identified as the followers of Gog, then Gog is connected with the locusts in Joel. Ezek 38:17 (where Gog is described as the one the Lord has spoken about in former times through his servants the prophets of Israel) indicates that Ezek has summarized and collected invading figures in preceding prophets in his picture of Gog in chapters 38–39, and if so, it would be natural to connect the invaders in Joel with all these other invaders. There are several thematic connections between Ezek and Joel. In both passages many nations (Ezek 38:5, 7, 15; Joel 2:20; 3:1–2) from the north (Ezek 38:6; 39:2; Joel 2:20) invade the land of Israel (גִּי; Ezek 38:8, 9; Joel 1:6; 2:8), and in both contexts the fate of the enemy is similar (Ezek 39:2–8; Joel 2:20; see Bruce, 19). The tradition of using the name “Gog” for various enemies of Israel that was traced above in the LXX and other related literature suggests that it would have been natural to connect the enemies of Israel in Ezek 38–39 and Joel. How then does Joel's vision connect with the LXX of Amos? The two Greek words used in LXX-Amos 7:1 for “locust” occur often in Joel (ἀχρίς 3 × in Joel 1:4 and 2:25; βροῦχος 3 × in Joel 1:4 and 2:25), and the connection of the locusts and enemies of Israel in both passages would form a bridge between the passages in the mind of the translator. Thus it is likely Bruce is correct that Joel was the bridge between Gog in Ezek and the LXX of Amos.

What is clear is that the LXX rendering of Amos 7:1 is a theological interpretation that was influenced by the translator's worldview and theology and that there was an interpretive tradition concerning Gog along the lines discussed above. The singular language in Amos 7:1b (“one locust ... Gog the king”) requires that Gog be a definite character here (perhaps Antiochus Epiphanes or another character like him) and not a collective figure. The singular verb “if he finishes” that describes the actions of Gog in 7:2 continues the reference to an individual. The “swarm of locusts” is apparently his army, not another reference to him. Also in Amos 7:1 Gog is presented as an eschatological character, fulfilling the prophecy of Ezek 38–39, who will lead his army against Israel in the future (cf. the eschatological emphasis in 4:13 and in the reference to Gog in LXX-Num 24:7). Furthermore, the connection with Ezek 38–39 brings an element of optimism and the hope of final triumph for Israel to the catastrophic prophecy in Amos, since Gog and Magog are completely destroyed by God in Israel's final battle in Ezek 38–39.

If there is a note of optimism for Israel in 7:1, it does not continue in 7:2. However, the beginning of 7:2 seems to continue the eschatological tone that was suggested in 7:1. The time and sequence of events in 7:1–2 is difficult, but it is probably best to understand 7:1 as a summary statement of the vision

and 7:2 as a look at specific details in the vision that concern Israel and affect a response from the prophet. The first two verbs in 7:2 in the protasis of the conditional sentence are awkward because they do not match the time suggested by the aorist at the beginning of the apodosis, which I have translated, “then I said.” They are a good example of the fact that the time of a verb is determined primarily by the context. (See Garrett, 207–208, for a discussion of similar difficulties in the Hebrew.) The subjunctive in “finishes devouring” (συντελέσῃ τοῦ καταφαγεῖν) suggests an unfinished act, and in the LXX the action of finishing to eat the grass is probably best understood as a future open possibility. “If” (or “when”) Gog (and his army) should finish devouring the grass “of the land” (τῆς γῆς is likely a reference to Israel), then Amos speaks to intercede on Israel’s behalf. Καί introduces the apodosis of the conditional sentence (“then I said”), and the apodosis is not only the effect of the protasis, but it also takes the reader back to the verb in 7:1a, “the Lord showed me,” because it follows the whole vision. Thus, verses 1–2a are what the Lord showed the prophet; the detail of the prophecy concerning Israel that the Lord showed him in 7:2a is the protasis of the conditional sentence. The prophet speaks in 7:2b–3 as a consequence of the details he saw concerning Israel’s future in 7:2a, but the sequence of his speaking follows what the Lord showed him, not the fulfillment of Gog completely devouring the grass of the land. He only saw Gog devour the land in a vision, and then he called out to the Lord to be merciful.

Note the aposiopesis in the NETS translation of 7:2 that produces a similar sense (“if they finish to devour the grass of the land—and I said ...”). The NETS rendering understands the apodosis of the condition to be unspoken, and what the prophet says is not the apodosis of the preceding protasis, but rather follows an unspoken apodosis. It is unlikely that a Greek reader would understand it that way; see the discussion of ἐάν in MUR, 183 and the parallel constructions in 6:9 and Zech 13:3; NETS renders Zech 13:3 as a complete conditional construction.

The combination of ἵνα and a copulative verb, as in the petition “be merciful” in 7:2, is a common phrase in the LXX for God’s willingness to forgive Israel or the nation’s petitions to him for forgiveness and mercy (e.g. Exod 32:12; Deut 21:8; Jer 5:1, 7; 27:20). Especially important are the occurrences in 2 Macc 2:7, 22; 4 Macc 6:28; 12:17. In these passages Eleazer and his sons voice their dependence on the Lord. In 2 Macc 2:22 the success of the Maccabees is attributed to the fact that the Lord “became gracious to them.” This passage, which is a summary of the whole period, is especially important for Amos 7:1–3, because the previous verse (2 Macc 2:21) states that their success happened though they were “few in number” (ὀλίγος). See also 1 Macc 3:16–17, using

ὀλιγοστός. The superlative form (ὀλιγοστός; Smyth, § 319), which is commonly used for the adjective in the LXX (Mur, 402), is used in Amos 7:2 and 5 in the prophet's petitions for Israel. The LXX translators often use this word to describe Israel, many times substituting it for a more general concept like small or insignificant (Mic 5:2; Obad 2; Isa 14:14; 60:22). That is what the translator has done in Amos 7:2 and 5; in the LXX no one except the Lord can raise up Jacob because he is so small in number (see Park, 158).

In the LXX the prophet's words continue into 7:3 with the entreaty in the form of an imperative, "Repent," followed by the vocative, "O Lord." The Lord responds to the prophet's request and declares that the devastation by Gog's locusts will not come to pass. This conclusion to the vision is consistent with the end of Gog in Ezek 38–39.

Visions of Fire and a Man on a Wall of Adamant and the Lord's Mercy, 7:4–7

In B this paragraph (7:4–7) includes the whole account of the second vision (7:4–6) and the actual vision (7:7) in the account of the third vision (7:7–9). Why the scribe included verse 7 in this paragraph is difficult to determine. The second vision account (7:4–6) forms a pair with the first (7:1–3), following the same structure. It is a vision of judgment by fire that devours, rather than by locusts, but more than half of the language is the same as 7:1–3. The intensity of the discussion increases in this vision, because the verb "devour" is repeated twice in this judgment; also, the prophet is more desperate and implores that judgment "cease" rather than the Lord "repent," as in the first vision, and he adds urgency to the request with the use of the particle *δή* (Mur, 111–112). Also, the Lord makes a stronger promise to refrain from the judgment (οὐ μή with aorist subjunctive): "This will never come to pass." This strong reply is an appropriate response to the desperation and intensity of the prophet's request.

The Lord summons this judgment by fire, and it is so powerful and ferocious that it devours the "great deep," the vast reservoirs of subterranean waters that are the source of the springs and rivers of the earth. The word translated "deep" (ἄβυσσος) is used elsewhere in Greek literature for the "fountains of the deep" that were the sources of the flood, Gen 7:11; 8:2; the source of the rivers, Ezek 31:4; and the source of the Nile, Herodotus, *Hist.* 2.228. This fire also devours the "portion of the Lord," which in light of the prophet's request in 7:5–6 appears to be Israel. For the last part of the vision (7:5–6), see the comments on 7:2b–3.

The vision in 7:7 is included in this paragraph separated from the interpretation and discussion of it in 7:8–9, which are further divided into two

paragraphs in B. This vision is parallel to the one in 8:1–3. In each the Lord asks Amos what he sees and then the Lord expounds the meaning of the vision. Also, in these visions the Lord does not forgive, and each of these visions is followed by an explanation that forms a unit with the vision (7:10–17; 8:4–14). In 7:7 the participle, “standing” (ἑστηκώς), has no explicit subject, but since it is a masculine participle and the subject is further identified by the pronoun αὐτοῦ later in the verse, it must refer to an indefinite “man” or “the Lord.” See text notes. Since κύριος is the subject of the preceding verb, it is likely that he would also be understood to be the subject of the participle (Park, 159). It is possible that the translator wanted to avoid any reference to a vision of the Lord “standing on a wall,” but he does not seem to be concerned about such things elsewhere (9:1); the identity of the one standing on the wall of hard metal is not the most important feature in the vision, because in the next verse what is seen is “hard metal,” not a person. At any rate, the prophet sees a vision of the one standing “on, upon” or “by, near” (ἐπὶ with the gen.) a wall of “hard metal.” It is impossible to know the exact sense of the preposition here, but “on, upon” is the more normal translation for this construction (BDF, § 234, [1]; LSJ, 621; Mur, 207); this is always the idea of ἐπὶ with a genitive object in Amos (cf. 1:11; 3:5; 5:2, 8; 6:4; 8:9; 9:6, 15, and probably 9:1), and it makes good sense in this verse (so Brenton, NETS, and Dines, 222).

Since the point of the vision (7:8) is the “hard metal,” what is this “adamant” or “hard metal”? The adjective (ἀδαμάντινος) occurs only in 7:7 and in 4 Macc 16:13 in the LXX where it is used metaphorically to refer to the resolution of the mother of the martyrs, who has a “mind like adamant.” The noun (ἀδάμας) occurs only in 7:7–8 (3×) in the LXX. When the substantive is used literally it refers to “the hardest metal, probably steel” and to a “diamond” (LSJ, 20). See Dines (225–226) for a survey of the use of these words in non-biblical Greek (note esp. Pliny’s description of hard stones, *Natural History* 37, 55–60, 200). The adjective (ἀδαμάντινος) in 7:7a is not used here metaphorically, referring primarily to an attribute of the wall (i.e., “unconquerable”) as it is used in 4 Macc 16:13, because the one standing on the wall holds “adamant, hard metal” (noun form) in his hand in 7:7b. The wall in Amos 7 must be made out of or consists of “adamant,” i.e., a genitive of content, like in “bucket of wood” (Mur, 7).

In the LXX the image of a wall is used to communicate several different notions (Dines, 228–229; see Jer 1:18–19; 15:20; Ezek 4:3; 2 Macc 11:9; Zech 2:5; *Test. Jud.* 9, 4 and *1 Enoch* 14, 9). The supernatural element in these various images of a wall is possibly similar to the image of the wall in Amos 7:7, but beyond that these other uses of the image do not help in understanding what Amos 7:7 is picturing. The only other mention of “walls” in Amos is in the

judgment oracles of Amos 1 (1:7, 10, 12, 14) where the walls of four cities are destroyed by fire in the Lord's judgment on the nations. This symbolizes the Lord's destruction of their strength, and it is likely that the wall imagery in 7:7 also symbolizes strength, especially since it is made of "hard metal."

Thus, perhaps the wall in Amos 7:7 symbolizes a strong barrier which separates the Lord from Israel, indicating his separation from them. Or perhaps it is best to see the "hard metal" in the LXX as a symbol of the Lord's strength; he is invincible on a wall of such metal and with such metal in his hand. But then why does the Lord place such metal in the midst of Israel (7:8) if he is not going to pass through them any more? It is also possible that the wall of hard metal could represent Israel's strength and false security, and the piece of metal in the Lord's hand could indicate he is tearing down their false security and demonstrating how weak they really are; this fits well with 7:9, but then why does the Lord place or establish hard metal in the midst of the people in 7:8? Perhaps this indicates his sovereign control of the events that will lead to their judgment for their sins; in other words he is the very one who establishes or places the false security in Israel. This is another way that he controls their destiny and causes judgment to come on the nation. At least it seems certain that the vision symbolizes judgment, and perhaps we should not try to press the meaning of every detail in it.

Amos Sees Hard Metal, 7:8a

In the accounts of the third and fourth visions the Lord asks Amos what he sees, and Amos responds briefly (see also 8:2). This short paragraph and the next both begin, "And the Lord said to me," and perhaps this statement signaled a new division to the scribe (cf. 8:2, but there the two statements differ slightly from 7:8). Or perhaps the scribe started a new paragraph here because he wanted to emphasize what Amos saw: "hard metal," which seems to be the point of the vision. (But he did not so divide the question and brief response in 8:2.) It is interesting that in response to the Lord's query Amos does not mention that he sees the wall or one standing in the vision; the hard metal of which the wall is made and which is in the Lord's hand is what he says he sees.

The Lord's Explanation of the Vision of Hard Metal, 7:8b-9

This short paragraph contains the Lord's explanation of the third vision in Amos. The explanation is not as clear as we would like and leaves us with several questions. The first question involves what the Lord is doing with the "hard metal" and revolves around the meaning of the verb ἐντάσσω ("I

am placing"). In non-biblical Greek the verb means "register" or "insert" in a document or record, "insert" as inserting names in a list or troops in military ranks, and "assign" a position in battle (LSJ, 574; Dines, 229–230). It occurs three times elsewhere in the LXX (2 Esd 7:17 [B]; Job 15:22 [A]; 4 Macc. 2:8 [A]) and four times in Dan Th (5:24, 25; 6:11; 10:21). Dines studies the verb and concludes that the evidence favors the idea that the "hard metal" is "something on which or with which the Lord is writing" (233; see the detailed discussion on 229–233). I am not convinced by her arguments because the verb does not always have the idea of inscribing or registering, even in the LXX (see 4 Macc 2:8 [A]; cf. the discussion in Dines, 231), and when it is a finite verb and has the idea of "inscribe" or "register" in a document, usually the document or record in which the writing is done is in the dative or modified by a preposition (i.e., 2 Esd 7:17 [B]; possibly Job 15:22 [A]; Dan Th 10:21). This is what one would expect in Amos 7:8 if it is describing writing on the "hard metal," but the hard metal is in the accusative and is apparently the object of the verb. Thus, it seems more likely in light of the context and use of ἐντάσσω elsewhere in the LXX and Dan Th that the Lord is "placing" (Mur, 188) or "inserting" (NETS; Brenton has "appoint") hard metal in the midst of his people.

Before trying to understand what the "hard metal" is that the Lord places in the midst of his people, it would be wise to look at the next clause, "never again will I pass by him." The object "him" (αὐτόν) could refer to the "wall" or "hard metal" but in the parallel phrase in 8:3 it clearly refers to Israel, and that must be the case here also. Not to "pass by" (παρέρχομαι) could have a positive (promise) or a negative (threat) connotation (see Dines, 233–235). The verb is used in a good sense when one stops (does not pass by) as a guest or friend (Gen 18:3; Exod 23:5; Isa 33:22) or because one would pass by in judgment (Dan 11:10, 26); however, not to "pass by" is also used in a bad sense when it means safety for one to pass by (Exod 12:23b; Isa 28:15–19). The judgment context of this vision in Amos makes a threat the most natural way to understand the "never ... pass by" in 7:8 (note esp. 7:9 where again the objects in view are all related to "Israel"). The parallel phrase in 8:2 supports this understanding (the only other time παρέρχομαι occurs in LXX-Twelve). The expression must mean that the Lord is no longer going to pass by Israel with his judgment (see 7:1–6); instead he is going to visit them with it. The fact that Amos does not intercede for mercy, as he did in the first two visions, shows that he realizes it is no longer feasible or possible to intervene for Israel; this prophecy spells unavoidable punishment.

As suggested above in 7:7, the hard metal may represent Israel's seemingly impregnable defenses. The reason why the Lord places the hard metal in the midst of his people Israel in the vision in 7:8 may be to picture his sovereignty

over Israel and its institutions and his responsibility for their false confidence, which will result in their judgment. The hard metal in his hand symbolizes his control over Israel's seemingly impregnable institutions and defenses. Their false confidence is itself a form of judgment, and 7:9 pictures the downfall of religious and political institutions in Israel.

Verse 9 spells out the specific details of this imminent judgment. Israel's worship sites, worship, and reigning dynasty are going to be eradicated (see also 3:14–15). “Altars of derision” (βωμοὶ τοῦ γέλωτος) is another difficult phrase. In non-biblical Greek βωμός is a normal word for “altar,” but in the LXX with only a few exceptions (Mur, 92; see Num 3:10; 2 Macc 2:19; 13:8; Sir 50:12, 14) its use is reserved for pagan altars (always used of pagan altars in Exod, Deut, 2 Chron, 1 Macc, Isa, the Twelve, and Jer). It is often used in connection with idolatry (e.g. Hos 10:8; Jer 7:31; Isa 15:2; see Dines 238). 1 Macc 1:59 (also 1:54) illustrates the difference between the βωμός and the θυσιαστήριον, the legitimate altar. That verse describes the Syrians “offering sacrifice on the altar that was on top of the altar of burnt offering” (θυσιάζοντες ἐπὶ τὸν βωμόν δς ἦν ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου). The use of βωμός in Amos 7:9 establishes the northern altars as pagan and idolatrous (Dines, 238).

Γέλως not only means “laughter,” but it can also have the sense of “derision” (Wis 5:4; Mic 1:10) or “laughing stock” (Jer 20:7; 31:26; 31:39; Lam 3:14), and the “mocking at idols” motif is common in Scripture (Ps 134[135 MT]:15–18; Isa 44; Wis 13:10–13). LEH (88) suggest the translation “the ridiculous high places.” Such a derisive or mocking description seems fitting in Amos 7:9 where γέλως is modifying βωμός. The next clause continues the negative depiction of the worship and cult of Israel, which the Lord will destroy.

The mention of αἱ τελεταὶ in the second clause of 7:9 reinforces the highly charged effect of the first clause. In non-biblical Greek the plural of this term (always pl. in the LXX) is used most often of rites of initiation into the Mysteries or festivals accompanied by mystic rites (LSJ, 1771; see Dines, 239). In its few occurrences in the LXX the plural refers to “the most extreme idolatrous practices” (Dines, 239; see Wis 12:4 where such practices are connected with sorcery; Wis 14:15 where they are connected with idolatry; Wis 14:23 where they are connected with infanticide). At any rate, τελετη in 7:9 makes a strong comment on the worship in Israel.

It is understandable that Jews, including our translator, would feel hostility toward the Mysteries. Civil rights and political privilege were often linked with membership in a Mystery cult (see Dines, 239). In 3 Macc 2:30 Jews who will apostatize and join the cult of Dionysus are promised political rights equal to those of native Alexandrians (see Croy, 60–61). Those who do not apostatize are to be killed. It is clear that Amos 7:9 is using the term τελετη

in a negative and condemnatory manner, and after the previous mention of the pagan “altars of derision” the impact would be great, especially in a place like Alexandria.

Thus, the Lord is going to destroy the idolatrous and pagan altars of Israel, and he is going to make desolate their pagan mystic rites. But he is also going to rise up against the ruling dynasty, the house of Ieroboam. (See the discussion in 1:4 about the “house of Hazael” and the “palaces of Ben-Hadad.”) The religious and political institutions of Israel are condemned to total destruction. The remainder of Amos 7, which is in the form of a dispute between Amaziah the priest and Amos and develops further the content of 7:7–9, is connected to 7:7–9 by references to Ieroboam in both sections.

E. Amos 7:10–9:10

Amaziah Rejects Amos’ Words Concerning Ieroboam, 7:10–11

In B Amos 7:10 is the beginning of the fifth major section of the book (7:10–9:10). The new section is marked by a capital *epsilon* in the left margin at the beginning of 7:10, which is also the beginning of a new paragraph, marked as always by the extension of the first letter into the left margin. The end of the paragraph beginning in 7:10 is difficult to determine, but it appears that the scribe extends the first letter of 7:12 into the left margin and intends to begin a new paragraph in 7:12. The scribe may have intended the small horizontal line above the beginning of 7:12 to confirm the division (see Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible*, 70–71).

The section 7:10–17 illustrates the obstinacy of the leadership of Israel and the futility of anyone continuing to intercede on behalf of the nation. Verses 10–11 record Amasias’ response to the judgment on the house of Ieroboam decreed in 7:9. Amasias the priest, who is the official representative of the state-sponsored religion, counters the indictment against Ieroboam by sending an envoy or message to Ieroboam containing an attack on Amos in 7:10–11. The charge that Amasias makes against Amos is in 7:10, and the support for this charge is the summary he gives of Amos’ message in 7:11. The charge is conspiracy, suggesting political treason. The charge that Amos is “engaged in plots” (συστροφὰς ποιεῖται) is periphrasis, consisting of a present tense verb and a verbal noun (see Smyth, §1722), and suggests ongoing activity. The noun συστροφή has the basic meaning of an assembly or gathering; however, it was also used for a “tumultuous gathering” and the “product of a clandestine gathering,” a “plot” or “conspiracy” (BDAG, 979; see also Mur, 542 and LEH, 464). “The midst of the house of Israel” refers

to the royal sanctuary at Bethel (7:13), which Ieroboam had established to compete with Jerusalem (3 Kgdms 12:26–33). Amos' words against this state sanctuary as well as the judgment he prophesied upon the house of Ieroboam are interpreted as conspiracy or treason against the king. His acts are "against you [Ieroboam]" (κατὰ σοῦ). Amasias reports that the "land" (meaning here the kingdom) will never be able to "endure" the things Amos is doing, because he prophesies of Ieroboam's death by the sword and the captivity of the nation (7:11). Apparently Amasias' comment that Amos says "Ieroboam will perish by the sword" is based on Amos' proclamation of the words of the Lord in 7:9. Amos' prophecies of exile are well documented (4:2–3; 5:5, 26–27; 6:7; 9:4). The δέ in 7:11 has been translated "while" to bring out some adversative force (following Dines, 740, n. 47; see Mur, 106). (The particle δέ only occurs five times in Amos; see also 2:9; 4:7; 7:13 and 17.) Also, the phrase "will be led away captive" occurs again in 7:17 and is the very same construction in the LXX (αἰχμάλωτος ἀχθήσεται) in both places (see Glenney, 54).

What is most important about Amasias' report to Ieroboam is what he leaves out (Paul, 240). Amasias does not claim the things reported to Ieroboam are "the word of the Lord"; instead he claims, "this is what Amos says." Second, he omits the reason for the judgment, the sins of Israel. Third, he leaves out the judgments prophesied in 7:9 on the worship and cult centers and in doing so omits what was probably of most direct concern to him; thus, he gives the impression he has no personal motive for the report. The reader understands that in rejecting the prophet Amos Amasias is rejecting the word of the Lord that Amos proclaims.

In Confrontation with Amasias Amos Confirms His Call and the Judgment on Israel, 7:12–17

This paragraph is naturally divided into three parts. First, Amasias directly commands Amos to leave Israel and not to prophesy at Bethel anymore (7:12–13). Then Amos responds to Amasias, explaining his call from the Lord to prophesy (7:14–15). Finally, Amos concludes his response with a confirmation of the words of destruction from the Lord (7:16–17). There is no evidence that the commands from Amasias in 7:12–13 are based on a royal decree, and it appears that Amasias took control of the situation in Bethel and issued the commands himself. The narrative in the paragraph contrasts the authority of Amasias and the Lord. Amasias addresses Amos as "seer" (see BDF, § 147 and Mur, 394, on the nominative for the vocative; also see Hos 8:2), an appropriate title for him in the midst of the section of book containing his five visions.

The commands from Amasias, “Go, you depart into the land of Judah” (7:12), are parallel and diametrically opposed to the commands the Lord gave to Amos, “Go, prophesy to my people Israel” (7:15). The issue is where Amos will prophesy. The Lord wants him to leave Judah to prophesy in Israel and commands him to go (βάδιζε) and do so, and Amasias wants him to leave Israel to prophesy in Judah and commands him to go (βάδιζε) and do so. In each case the first command (βάδιζε) is in the present tense, because the present tense is used idiomatically in commands with verbs of motion to emphasize the continuing or extended nature of the action (Fanning, 341, 365). Commands in the aorist such as the verbs ἐκχώρησον and προφήτευσον usually emphasize the specific action commanded (BDF, § 335). However, the aorist of the second verb (“prophesy”) could have been chosen to emphasize the iterative nature of the prophesying (Fanning, 355) or, more likely, to present the action as a whole (Wallace, 557–558).

The last part of 7:12 explains what Amos is to do when he arrives in Judah, using two commands, “live your life there and you shall prophesy there.” The command to “live your life there” has the idea of living out life until one dies (LSJ, 885). Amasias knows that Amos must prophesy, but he simply wants him to do it in another location.

The contrast between 7:13 and the last clause in 7:12 is marked with one of the five occurrences of δέ in Amos (see 7:11). The future tense in B (instead of the aor. subj.) and the absence of μή (see text notes) do not weaken the command (C & S, § 74). The use of οὐκέτι makes it clear that Amasias does not want Amos ever to prophesy in Bethel again (Mur, 422). The reason for the commands on 7:12–13a is given in 7:13b. The parallel description of Bethel as “the king’s sanctuary and ... the royal house” must refer to the facts that Ieroboam established this sanctuary (3 Kgdms 12:26–33) and it has official status. He had great authority and interest in it (esp. 3 Kgdms 12:31–33). This is why Amos’ words against this place are called conspiracy and are against the king (see 7:10). “Royal house” in this context cannot refer to the palace or king’s residence, since 7:10 indicates Ieroboam was not nearby.

In 7:14–15 Amos responds to Amasias, explaining his call from the Lord to prophesy. The use of the imperfect tense in 7:14 to describe Amos before the Lord told him to prophesy (7:15) clearly casts this as what he “used to be,” contrasting with 7:15. Dines (241) explains that the past tense in the LXX “indicates a complete break between his life ‘then’ and ‘now’; i.e. he is no longer a goatherd etc. but is altogether ‘prophet.’” Negatively described (7:14a), he was not in any way connected with the prophetic guild before the Lord called him to prophesy to Israel (cf. the discussion of 7:15). In contrast, positively described (7:14b), he used to be “a goatherd and a scratcher of

sycamore tree fruit.” The construction ἀλλ’ ἤ, which contrasts the negative and positive in 7:14 could be rendered “nothing other than” (Dines, 241; BDF, § 448, [8]) or simply “but rather” (Mur, 19); the former makes sense if Amos is described as a “goatherd” (αἰπόλος; a LXX *hapax*) to emphasize his humble origins, which seems possible (see Dines, 242–243 for this emphasis in the Fathers; in the Targum Amos is a wealthy farmer). If the emphasis is on Amos’ humble origins, it connects Amos with the poor and separates him from the well-to-do oppressors, who bear the brunt of his exhortations and prophecies of judgment.

“Scratcher of sycamore tree fruit” is the translation of two words, both of which only appear this one time in the LXX (κνίζων συκάμινα). This phrase corresponds to what in the MT is often translated “a dresser of sycamore trees” (בֹּוֹלֵם שְׁקָמִים). The neuter noun translated “sycamore tree fruit” (συκάμινα) could also refer to the fruit of the mulberry tree (LSJ, 1670; Cripps, 234), but the feminine noun (συκάμινος; LSJ, 1670), the word for mulberry tree, was used in Egypt for the sycamore. Therefore, if the Minor Prophets were translated in Egypt it would be natural for the translator to use συκάμινα, often used for the fruit of the mulberry tree, to refer to the fruit of the sycamore tree, which is the common understanding of the word in LXX-Amos (Mur, 528). Dines (242) comments that the translator “was just using the local term for the tree.”

The meaning of the participle κνίζων is also somewhat obscure. According to LSJ (965) the primary meaning of the verb κνίζω is “to scratch, gash” (also Mur, 528), and LSJ cites Amos 7:14 (κνίζων συκάμινα), suggesting the gloss “to make them ripen.” The gloss is based on a passage (2. 51b) in *Daipnosophistae* by Athenaeus (see the discussion in Muraoka, “Hebrew Hapax Legomena,” 212). That passage describes how the Egyptians make a slight incision with a knife in the figs of the Egyptian fig trees, and as a result the figs ripen and are edible. Theophrastus (*History of Plants* 4, 2, 1, using ἐπικνίζω) and Pliny (*Natural History* 13, 14, 56) describe this same process. Dines (242) suggests that since this practice “was common in Egypt at the time of the translator, [he] would easily have assumed that Amos was doing the same thing” (see also Wright, 363). With its use of this terminology the LXX appears to describe menial activity and further emphasize the lowliness and relative insignificance of Amos before his call to prophesy, as was suggested by the rendering “goatherd.” This is a marked contrast from the Targum, which pictures Amos as a wealthy landowner.

The verb ἀναλαμβάνω at the beginning of 7:15 (“took ... up”) reinforces the idea of Amos’ insignificance before his call. In B the Lord takes Amos up from among the “prophets” (partitive idea; he is singled out from a group), a reading that all modern editions consider a mistake (see text notes). The

reading in B involves the confusion of two Greek letters, and it suggests another stage in Amos' early career as a prophet after he left his farming and before the Lord commissioned him to go to Israel. Perhaps for the scribe responsible for B the following command that Amos "go, prophesy" required that he be a prophet first, and perhaps he felt that it did not make much sense to say Amos was "taken up from among the sheep" (Park, 161). The reading "prophets" in 7:15 in B is in tension with Amos' protest in 7:14b that he "was not a prophet," but it would apparently be understood to mean that after he was a farmer he was a prophet for a time before he was sent to Israel, and then he was called from among "the prophets" to go to Israel.

As mentioned in 7:12, the Lord's command to Amos to "Go, prophecy to my people Israel" in 7:15 is parallel to and contrasts with the command of Amasias. Integral to the command of the Lord was the location where Amos was to prophesy, and if Amos obeyed Amasias and left Israel, he would not be obeying the Lord.

In 7:16–17 Amos switches from his defensive self-justification speech (7:14–15) to the offensive; he concludes his response to Amasias with the pronouncement of an oracle of judgment from the Lord. Amos begins by summarizing Amasias' commands to him. Amasias' message is twofold. He says Amos is to "stop prophesying" (In this context the present tense imperative must have the sense not to continue, Wallace, 724.) He also says Amos is never to "play the demagogue against the house of Israel." (This construction, οὐ μὴ plus the future tense [or the subjunctive mood], is the strongest way to make something negative in Greek, Wallace, 468, 571.) The difficulty with this last command is the meaning of the *hapax* ὀχλαγωγέω. The Greek word ὀχλαγωγέω and its cognates are blatantly uncomplimentary. Polybius 24, 7, 2 uses it to describe an "unscrupulous young demagogue"; Strabo 14, 2, 5 uses it of a person attracting a crowd. The noun ὀχλαγωγός is used of a quack doctor in Galen 14, 305 and in Vettius Valens 78, 18, and Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 2, 1 uses it to describe Apion (see Dines, 244–245, n. 58). In Amos 7:16 this verb explains Amasias' negative attitude toward Amos. NETS renders it "incite a mob"; Dines renders it "draw crowds" or "play the charlatan." They are both close to the definitions in LSJ (1281): "court the mob, attract a crowd." Muraoka's "play the demagogue" (426) seems to summarize the sense of the word and fits the context in Amos well, where Amasias seems to be charging Amos with trying to stir up the people to win them over and threaten the king (7:10). Amasias commands Amos never to "play the demagogue against the house of Iacob." "Iacob" occurs often in LXX-Amos (3:13; 6:8; 7:2, 5; 8:7; 9:8), and it is a broad term, always including the northern tribes.

In 7:17 Amos proclaims a fourfold judgment against Amasias, which is related to Amos' message of Israel's "captivity." First, his wife will be a prostitute in "the city," suggesting she will be separated from him and will be forced to turn to prostitution to support herself. His children will die by the sword, perhaps at the hands of an invading army. His land will be measured out and taken by conquerors (Mur, 301), and he will die in an "unclean land," apparently in captivity. The verb "measured out" (καταμετρέω) (7× in the LXX) is used for measuring to establish borders (Num 34:7, 8, 10), to measure for selling (Ezek 48:14), to measure for inheritance (Ezek 45:1), and to describe the measuring of conquered land by an enemy or oppressor, as in Amos 7:17; it focuses on the "measuring" for the purpose of dividing.

Amos' words conclude with a restatement of the message he had been preaching, "Israel will be led away captive from his land." The last clause of the verse repeats verbatim the words of Amasias in 7:11b (see discussion at 7:11); its inclusion here at the end of the section creates an ironic reversal of what Amasias rejected in 7:11 and a rhetorical emphasis on this theme (Smith, 327). Amasias could not suppress the truth the Lord had sent Amos to prophesy to Israel.

In Amos 7 the historical situation in northern Israel (esp. 7:10–17) is mixed with eschatological judgment (esp. 7:1). The implication is that the aspects in Amos' visions concerning the northern kingdom, including its captivity (esp. 7:17), have been fulfilled, and the eschatological aspects are still to be expected.

Vision of a Fowler's Cage, 8:1–3

Amos' fourth vision is parallel to the third (7:7–9); in both the Lord asks Amos what he sees and then explains the meaning of the vision. Both visions foretell judgment on Israel (the Lord will not "pass by"), and then the following verses develop each vision (7:10–17 and 8:4–14). Whereas the third vision focused on the king and temple, this vision focuses on the whole nation, and it goes beyond the previous three, announcing "the end has come."

As with the third vision, it is difficult to determine exactly what Amos sees in this vision; in 8:1 and 2 it is described as ἄγγος ἰξεντοῦ. There is a consensus that ἰξεντοῦ refers to a "fowler" or "bird catcher" in 8:1 and 2, as in its other LXX occurrence in 3:5 (LSJ, 831; Mur, 270; Dines, 246;), and that it functions as a possessive genitive. The issue is what the "fowler" possesses; what is the ἄγγος? The basic idea of the word is container or vessel, and it is used in a variety of circumstances, including a vat for wine, a casket, the human womb, and the cell of a honeycomb (LSJ, 7). LSJ (Rev Sup, 3) notes

that the word can refer to a large container such as a “box, chest or similar” (see Herodotus, *Hist.* 1.113 where it refers to the “box” in which a dead child is placed). It occurs four times elsewhere in the LXX, referring to a vessel for picked grapes (Deut 24:2[23:25 MT]), a vessel for water (3 Kgdms 17:10), an earthen vessel (Jer 19:11), and a vessel for grain and vegetables (Ezek 4:9). NETS, Brenton, and Mur (4) render it as “basket,” perhaps influenced by the MT; Dines follows the basic usage of the word elsewhere in the LXX and renders it “jar”; Wolff (317, n. b-b) translates it as “pouch,” which fits nicely in the context of a “fowler” or “bird catcher.” Surely the context must be the determining factor in deciding the meaning of this flexible word. Since ἄγγος refers to all kinds of containers, and since the LXX translator understood the Hebrew word to which it corresponds in its only other occurrence to refer to a “cage” for birds (Jer 5:27), I suggest it must refer to something similar in this context where it is identified as being possessed by a “fowler.” Thus I understand the container in Amos 8:1–2 to be a cage-like trap for birds, and I have translated it “cage.” (See Glenny, 81–82, on 8:1–2.)

Whatever the exact meaning of the words used to describe the vision, the meaning of the vision is clear from the preceding and from the interpretation that follows: the nation of Israel will be destroyed and go into captivity. (A fowler’s birdcage is fitting imagery for captivity.) In Amos 8:2 the Lord explains that the vision means “the end has come” (ἤκει τὸ πέρας). This phrase recurs in Jer 28:13 referring to Babylon; in Ezek 7:2 (2 ×; 1 × without the article), 3, 5 it refers to Israel (Judah). The verb has perfective force in the present tense and emphasizes the end point of a process (see Mur, 34–35). In this context the noun suggests “the end of existence, extinction” (Mur, 448). Israel has reached the limit of God’s patience and he “will not pass by him again.” See 7:8 for this phrase; it is not quite as emphatic in B in 8:2 as in 7:8, because in 7:8 it has a double negative and the subjunctive mood. In the context of Amos 8:2–3 it is clear that the Lord is no longer going to pass by Israel with his judgment; instead he is going to visit them with it.

Verse 3 describes wailing and death at the time of the Lord’s visitation of judgment on Israel. In the LXX the ceilings are wailing. The noun (φάτνωμα) is a technical term for “coffered work in a ceiling” in the LXX (LSJ, 1919), and it refers to a ceiling when singular (Ezek 41:20; 2 Macc 1:16) and when plural (Zeph 2:14; Song 1:17). Zeph 2:14, describing the desolation of Nineveh, is especially instructive, because the ceiling described in that verse has places in it where “chameleons” dwell; Mur (580) suggests that in Zeph 2:14 and Amos 8:3 it refers to a “coffer” in the ceiling (cf. φάτνη, “manger”). The two passages are similar, because in each the image of the “coffered ceiling” is used in a context of the Lord’s judgment. In Amos with its emphasis on the

corrupt rich it is appropriate for such ornamentation and decoration to wail. (See Glenny, 93, on the translation of this word.)

In LXX-Amos the “coffered ceilings” are “of the temple” (the LXX adds the article). “Temple” (ναός) is normally “the dwelling place of Yahweh” (Dines, 248; TDNT, 3:230–237, esp. 233) in the LXX. In the Twelve (10×) it is always so, except in Joel 3:5, where it is plural. In Amos 8:3 the article with the temple suggests that the translator may have had Jerusalem in mind. The verb “wail” (ὀλολύζω) is an onomatopoeic term with the basic idea of crying out with a loud voice, whether in exaltation or sorrow (LSJ, 1217; BDAG, 704). In the LXX (21×) it is always negative and generally refers to the howling of people in sorrow and grief when they experience the judgment of the Lord. The howling is sometimes directly related to the Day of the Lord (Isa 13:6). In Amos 8:3 “in that day” is circumlocution for the Day of the Lord, which is also in view in 8:9, 10, 11, and 13.

The clause “Many will be the fallen in every place” is awkward. This “verbless, asyndetic phrase is best understood as a kind of nominative absolute” (Dines, 248; see BDF, § 144 and § 466; C & S, § 51). In 8:2–3 the Lord explains the judgment represented by the image of the “fowler’s cage” as the end of his people Israel, apparently referring to their exile (8:2). The judgment results in wailing, the death of many, and silence (8:3). The Lord personally inflicts the silence on the nation, perhaps portraying the desolation after the deportation of its inhabitants.

Israel’s Abuse of the Poor Will Result in Its Mournful End, 8:4–10

Amos 8:4–14 develops the fourth vision as 7:10–17 developed the third. The section details the sin that brings the end of the nation (8:4–6) and the awful effects of the judgment for that sin (8:7–14). Several themes from the judgment described in the vision (8:2–3) are developed in verses 7–14 (esp. “the end” and “wailing”). In B this section is divided into two paragraphs (8:4–10 and 11–14). The paragraph 8:4–10 falls into three sections. Verses 4–6 pick up the theme of the abuse of the poor (see 2:6–8), giving further details of the economic exploitation involved. The Lord responds to this abuse with an oath affirming swift and sure punishment on the land and all who inhabit it (8:7–8). This punishment is the “Day of the Lord” (“that day” 7:9, 13; cf. “Behold, days are coming” 7:11), which involves the Lord’s intervention in the affairs of nature and will result in lamentation and mourning throughout the land (8:9–10; see also 5:16–17 and 8:3).

The command to “hear this” in 8:4 (cf. the same command in 3:1, 13; 4:1; 5:1; [7:16 sing.]) applies to both the accusation and the description of the

punishment that follows. The marker δὴ “invites attention to what is stated” (BDAG, 222), but it is more transitional here (see LSJ, 890) than emphatic (cf. its other occurrence in Amos in 7:5; Mur, 111). The Israelites who are being addressed are described by three substantival participles, controlled by one article (the third is the first word in 8:5 in B). The first participle in the phrase, “you who destroy a poor man in the early morning” (ἐκτρίβοντες) has the idea of rubbing or wiping out (LSJ, 523). In the LXX (52×) it often has the idea of “destroy completely” as here (Mur, 170). It appears to be the first part of a double translation (οἱ ἐκτρίβοντες εἰς τὸ πρωί; see Glenn, “Hebrew Misreadings,” 532–533). The sense of the phrase εἰς τὸ πρωί in Amos 8:4 is eagerness (Mur, 495). There is an increased intensity in the LXX in the remainder of the verse, which is consistent with this phrase.

The object of the “destruction” is the “poor” (πένης), a common description of the oppressed in Amos (4×: 2:6; 4:1; 5:12; 8:4). The other description of the oppressed in this verse and the object of the second participle is the “needy” (πτωχός 5× in Amos: 2:7; 4:1; 5:11; 8:4, 6). Occurrences of these words in Amos are clustered in the sections describing the sins of Israel. See the discussion of them in 2:6–7.

The second participle, “oppress” (καταδυναστεύοντες), has the idea “to cause [someone] unjust hardship” (Mur, 296) and is used for the treatment of slaves or people who are kidnapped (Exod 1:13; 21:17[16 MT]; Deut 24:7; Jer 27:33[50:33 MT]; see Wevers, *Exodus*, 330). In its other occurrence in Amos (4:1) it also describes the oppressors in Israel and is parallel to the phrase “[who] trample under foot the needy.” It is often used in the LXX “of outrages against the poor, widows, and orphans” (BDAG, 516; cf. Zech 7:10; Mal 3:5; Jer 7:6; 22:3; Ezek 22:7, 29). The following prepositional phrase “from the land” (ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς) could have the idea of separation, the basic sense of the preposition (BDAG, 105; Brenton). However, with this verb it is better explained as either having a partitive idea (“of the land”; Dines, 248, n. 1; C & S, § 92; BDF, § 209) or as having the idea of source (“from the land”; Mur, 51; Wallace, 368; BDF, § 210, 3; BDAG, 105–106). In this context the “land” is apparently a figure for the population that inhabits it (Mur, 97), and therefore, either of these understandings of ἀπὸ would work; the latter is more consistent with its basic sense.

In B 8:5 begins with another participle (λέγοντες) parallel to the two in 8:4 and also controlled by the article before the first participle in 8:4. The prophet validates his charge by means of a quotation, which he puts in the mouths of the people. (Note this technique in 2:12; 4:1; 5:14; 6:13; 7:10, 14; 8:10, 12, 16; 9:10.) In the LXX the primary theme in 8:5–6 is not limited to “grain” and “wheat” but involves deceit in trading “every kind of produce” (8:6b).

The noun γένημα refers generally to “produce of the fruit of the earth” (LSJ, 343; cf. BDAG, 193 and Mur, 95). The noun θησαυρός in 8:5 refers to a “storing room” or “magazine” (LSJ, 801; cf. Mur, 260), which could be used for grain (Joel 1:17; Mal 3:10), but in this context may include other kinds of produce.

The statements of the oppressors in 8:5–6 illustrate their perversity and greed for gain. They are anxious for the “month” and the “Sabbath” to pass so they can engage in their business again. In the context of the “Sabbath,” “month” (μήν) must refer to the religious festival of the new moon on the first day of the month (cf. Isa 1:13; 1 Kgdms 20:24).

The restrictions on work and selling on Sabbaths and new moon festivals hinder the perverse designs of the oppressors; their greed for economic gain is much stronger than their desire to worship God. They are anxious to resume their greedy and deceitful commercial transactions. Both measuring and weighing are necessary in their transactions, and they are dishonest in both. The three purposes for which they are anxious to “open the storehouse” and sell are marked by three infinitives connected by καί (2×) in the last half of 8:5. They desire to “make a measure small,” so they are able to sell less than standard (μέτρον is a general term for a unit of measure, Mur, 369–370; cf. Lev 19:35; Deut 25:14, 15). And they are anxious to “enlarge a standard weight,” so the purchasers pay them more than the agreed upon price (στάθμιον here refers to a weight used with a balance, Mur 520–521; cf. Lev 19:35–36; Deut 25:15; and Prov 11:1; 20:10). Finally they desire to “make a balance unjust,” or rig the scales. This construction is apparently an object complement construction after ποιέω (Smyth, §1613, 1616 calls it “external object and predicate accusative”; cf. Wallace, 182–187). If the adjective were a simple adjective it would describe the making of the balance rather than the rigging of them after they were made (“make an unjust balance”). Several passages in the LXX address the topic of a just balance (cf. Lev 19:35; Prov 11:1; 20:23; Hos 12:7; Mic 6:11).

The final purpose for the three infinitives in 8:5b is given with another infinitive at the beginning of 8:6. This asyndetic infinitive is separated from the previous string of three infinitives by the absence of καί, which was employed to connect the previous three. Thus, it expresses the ultimate purpose for the deceptive practices described by the infinitives in 8:5b, which is to be able to enslave the poor and needy of the land (8:6a). The oppressors want to cheat the poor and drive them into poverty and desperation so they can use the very money they swindle from the poor to purchase the poor and make them slaves. The poor will be forced to sell themselves into slavery to pay some of their debts or to acquire food. This verse recalls 2:6b where the selling of the poor into slavery was condemned; here it is the buying of them

that is condemned. In that context the phrase ἔνεκεν ὑποδημάτων describes the price for which the poor are sold; in 8:6 the phrase ἀντὶ ὑποδημάτων describes what the oppressors desire to give in exchange for the poor or the price they desire to pay for them (see LSJ, 153 and Mur, 42, on the preposition). To the oppressors the poor and needy are mere commodities to be purchased at the lowest price possible. See the discussion on the “poor” (πτωχός) in 2:7; 4:1; 5:11; and 8:4 and the “lowly” (ταπεινός) in 2:7.

In the last clause in 8:6, “and we will trade in every kind of product” (γενήματος means “product or produce”; see Glenny, 83, on this translation), the Greek ἀπὸ παντός gives the source from which the oppressors’ business comes; they trade “in every kind of produce” (see Mur, 51, who classifies this use of the preposition as “‘source or collection’ out of which selection is made”). This last clause is parallel to the two clauses with first person plural verbs in 8:5a (“we will do business” and “we will open the storehouse”). The first person plural future tense verbs in these three clauses are the main verbs in the direct discourse of the oppressive rich that the prophet recounts as evidence against them in 8:5–6, describing what the rich want to do as soon as the Sabbath and new moon are past. The four infinitives in 8:5b–6a all modify the two first person plural verbs in 8:5a (see discussion of the infinitives above), giving the purposes for the business dealings of the oppressors. The arrogance and hardness of the oppressive upper class against the poor leaves no doubt in the mind of the unbiased reader that they deserve the Lord’s judgment.

The Lord’s oath in 8:7 is his direct response to the charge against Israel in 8:4–6. The oath demonstrates the Lord’s irrevocable commitment to judge Israel. The Lord takes more oaths than any other figure in the OT, and twice before in Amos his oaths have affirmed the certainty of his stated intentions (4:2 and 6:8; cf. also 8:14). The oath formula (κατά plus the genitive) is used differently in 8:6 than in its other three occurrences in Amos. In 4:2, 6:8, and 8:14 the formula indicates whom or what the one swearing invokes to affirm the oath (i.e., “by ...”; Mur, 404; LEH, 331; see Gen 22:16). However, the preposition κατά with a genitive object can also mean “against” in an oath formula (Mur, 405), and in this context that meaning is more consistent. The word “arrogance” (ὑπερηφανία) is always negative in the LXX (57×), meaning “pride, arrogance” (Mur, 571; BDAG, 1033; Spicq, 3:392–394), with the possible exception of Esth 14:16. It is certainly in a negative context in Amos 8:7 and probably would give the reader the idea here commonly suggested by this word in Scripture: “a spiritual perversion and a kind of generalized vice (cf. Ps 73:6) whereby one stiffens the neck and refuses to take the divine commandment into account” (Spicq, 3:393; cf. Wevers, *Exodus*, 287). Note

its use in 1 Macc for Antiochus (1:21, 24) and the enemies of the Maccabees, who are not faithful to the law (2:47, 49–50). Thus, in Amos 8:7 the Lord is swearing against “the arrogance of Jacob,” and in this oath formula he is both speaking to and against Israel. The remainder of 8:7 gives the content of the oath. The content is introduced by εἰ, a “Hebraism in strong negation after verbs of swearing” (Mur, 145; C & S, § 90). The negative idea is required to make sense of the oath in which the apodosis of the conditional sentence is broken off.

In 8:7b the Lord swears that none of “your deeds” will be forgotten (see Satterthwaite, 16, and Glenney, 197, on this translation). The mention of “your deeds” hearkens back to the description of their sins in 8:4–6. “Forever” (εἰς νεῖκος) is an ambiguous phrase, and the issue of its meaning is complicated; see the textual notes and the more complete discussion in 1:11, which is assumed here (see also Kraft, *Septuagintal Lexicography*, 136, 153–156). LEH (314) suggests that rather than its normal meaning “in strife,” εἰς νεῖκος is a correction for εἰς νῖκος, meaning “until final victory, to the end, forever” (see also LSJ, 1176; Mur, 387). LEH’s understanding of the phrase makes sense in the oath formula of Amos 8:7 where “in strife” is awkward. Since εἰς νεῖκος in 1:11 probably means “forever,” and since “until final victory” is awkward in this context, I translated it “forever” here also, which is a natural rendering in this oath formula (so also Brenton and Dines, 250). Uniquely and apparently related to the idea of victory, NETS renders εἰς νεῖκος “successfully.”

The actions in 8:8–10 are the results of the oath in 8:7. Israel’s immoral behavior has cosmic consequences with effects on the earth and the sun (8:8–9) that are introduced by a rhetorical question at the beginning of 8:8. The rhetorical question poses for discussion the Lord’s judgment of Israel’s “deeds.” The Lord is going to send an earthquake because of Israel’s “deeds” (“for these things,” 8:8a refers back to the “deeds” of 8:7). “Be shaken” (ταράσσω) is often used in the passive voice for earthquakes (Mur, 548; cf. Isa 24:19; Jer 4:24; Pss 17:8; 45:3, 4; 76:17). An earthquake will cause the inhabitants of the land to mourn as the surface plates of the earth go up and down like the Nile (cf. Jer 26[46 MT]:7–8 where Egypt’s destruction of Judah is compared to the rising of the Nile). The “land” (γῆ) that is “shaken” in this context is not the earth in general but the land of Israel (also in 8:11; in 8:9 γῆ may refer primarily to Israel, but there it is the land as opposed to the sky, Mur, 96); the Day of the Lord imagery throughout this section probably does not predict the eschatological end of the world, but rather the judgment and destruction of Israel, or Israel’s end. The earthquake that occurred two years after the ministry of Amos (1:1) was probably considered to be a fulfillment of this prophecy (see also the prediction of an earthquake in 9:5).

The noun “destruction” (συντέλεια) in the clause “destruction will rise up like a river” (8:8) is often used in eschatological contexts speaking of divine vengeance (i.e., 2 Esd 19:31; Nah 1:8, 9; Zeph 1:18; Jer 4:27; 5:10, 18; 26[46 MT]:28; Ezek 11:13; 13:13; 20:17; Dan 9:27; Dan Th 9:27). Note the use of συντέλεια in 1:14 (see discussion) and 9:5 (see also Mur, 539). In each instance the translator’s use of this word is based on a reading differing from the MT, suggesting this was a favorite word for him. Dines (250) comments that it is impossible to discern from this translation whether references to the Nile had any eschatological resonances; however, the references to the Day of the Lord in this context would certainly have eschatological connections.

“That day” in 8:9 must refer to the Day of the Lord when the Lord intervenes directly and miraculously in the affairs of this world (cf. 8:3, 13). The reader has already learned that this day will be a day of darkness and not light (5:18, 20), and this verse continues that theme. The verb in the last clause (συσκοτάζω) could be transitive (Amos 5:8) or intransitive (Joel 2:10; 3[4 MT]:15) and the neuter noun “the light” (τὸ φῶς) could be the subject or object of the verb (“the daylight will darken” or “he [i.e., the Lord] will darken the light”). It is more natural to take “the light” as the subject, especially because of the subject “the sun” in the previous parallel clause. (See Glenny, 197–198, on this translation.)

The first two clauses of Amos 8:10 are cited in Tob 2:6, as from Amos, in a different form than the LXX. In that context the book of Tob connects the sorrowful reality of an unburied Jew in Nineveh with Amos’ prophecy in Amos 8:10. The fairly slight variations between the text form in Amos and Tob could be because the author of Tob is quoting from the LXX by memory or from a different Greek translation, or the changes could have been for theological or literary reasons, or the author of Tob could have made a free rendering of the Hebrew to fit his context (see Dines, 252, for a discussion of the options). Questions concerning the date and Greek text of Tob complicate the relationship of the quotation in Tob to LXX-Amos. The consensus is that Tob dates to the late third or early second century BCE (250–175 BCE; see ABD, 6:591; deSilva, 68–69). The Greek text of Tob has three different forms, and the recension (or edition) that is preferred today is based on Codex Sinaiticus attested to in the main by the Old Latin (ABD, 6:591; deSilva, 67–68). The quotation in Tob 2:6 is slightly different in the two main recensions (represented in English in RSV following Vaticanus and Alexandrinus and NRSV following Sinaiticus). If the translation of Tob from the original Hebrew or Aramaic was later than the translation of LXX-Twelve (as Harl, Dorival, and Munnich, 111, believe), the translator of Tob could have used LXX-Amos (see Dines for further discussion). But LXX-Twelve is usually dated to mid

second century BCE (Dines, *Septuagint*, 46), and there is nothing that rules out the possibility that the quotation in Tob is a free rendering of the Hebrew. If Milik (522–530, esp. 530) is correct in his suggestion that Tob was originally written as a piece of Tobiad propaganda and was then later touched up by a Judean editor, the Amos quotation could have been part of the later editing (Dines, 252; see 1:15 on the Tobiads). There are also verbal parallels to the Greek of Amos 8:10 in 1 Macc 9:41.

Amos 8:10 describes the mourning and grief that will accompany the “destruction” (8:8) on the Day the Lord (8:9). The “feasts” and joyous “songs” in the Bethel temple will be transformed into mourning and lament (cf. 5:16–17). Such actions in the temple are not surprising, since the temple itself will be destroyed (7:9; 8:3; 9:1). Everyone will put on sackcloth and pull out or shave their hair, the customary signs of mourning (Isa 22:12; Ezek 7:18; 27:31). The mourning will be of the most intense kind, as for a “beloved one.” This intense mourning is caused by loss of life and loss of hope.

The last clause in 8:10 is obscure in the LXX. The difficulty in the clause revolves around the antecedents of “him” or “it” (αὐτόν) and “those” in “those with him” (τοὺς μετ’ αὐτοῦ) and the meaning of θήσομαι. On the basis of the parallel phrase in 4:2 the phrase “those with him” (τοὺς μετ’ αὐτοῦ) would be expected to refer to people. Dines (253) mentions the possibility that this obscure LXX passage may refer to an ongoing tradition of mourning over Josiah (cf. 2 Chron 35:24–25; Targum of Amos 9:1) and the obscure pronoun αὐτόν in Amos 8:10 and Zech 12:10 refers to him. This is possible but unlikely. The pronoun in Zech 12:10 corresponds to the MT, and the addition of the pronoun in Amos 8:10 does not make a reference to a person like Josiah clear or easy in this context. Furthermore, the LXX translator of Jer 22:15–16 obscures Jeremiah’s respectful words about Josiah, which seems out of character if there was a continuing tradition of mourning for him in the time of the LXX translation (this could be the same translator who translated Amos). Dines (253) also suggests the pronoun αὐτόν might “simply mean ‘Israel’ as in Jer 6:26” (note πένθος ἀγαπητοῦ in both passages). This seems more likely, and I suggest similarly that the pronoun refers back to “Iakob” in the oath formula in 8:7. The repetition of “your” (ὁμῶν 2 × in 8:10a) reminds the reader of the same pronoun in the oath formula in 8:7 (“your deeds”) and connects the doers of the “deeds” with the participants in the “feasts” and “songs” in 8:10. Most importantly, this understanding of the last clause of 8:10 is somewhat coherent. The Lord will make Jacob as one who mourns for a beloved one and those with Jacob as those experiencing a day of grief. I understand τίθημι to have a causative sense (“ordain, make”) followed by an accusative object and ὥς clause (Mur, 555; cf. Hos 2:5[2:3 MT] and 11:8). It also

could have the sense of “reckon” or “establish” (LSJ, 1790–1792), but the first of these two words seems weak with the Lord as subject and the latter is similar to the idea I have chosen but without the causative or transformational idea of “make.” The phrases “mourning for a beloved” and “day of grief” are figurative descriptions of the people’s mourning and grief. The reader of LXX-Amos would have understood some such a meaning in the awkward construction.

It is likely that LXX readers would have seen a reference, if not at least an application, to Judah in this passage. The reference to “the temple” in 8:3 would have suggested the temple in Jerusalem. Also, the phrase to swear “against the pride of Iacob” (8:7) could be understood, at least, to include Judah. Also, as just mentioned, it is possible that “him” and “those with him” (8:10) could have been understood to refer to “Iakob,” including Judah. What is clear is that “Iakob” and “those with him” are in for mourning and grief.

The Lord Will Abandon Israel on “That Day,” 8:11–14

Amos 8:11–14 continues and completes the development of the fourth vision, which began in 8:4–10; the “presentative particle” ἰδοὺ at the beginning of 8:11 introduces a new section in the development comprised of “an eschatological pronouncement” (Mur, 267). The phrase “Behold, days are coming” refers to a coming era of divine judgment (4:2) or blessing (9:13). The judgment announced in 8:11 involves the silence and inaccessibility of the Lord, described as a “a famine of hearing the word of the Lord.” (The genitive articular infinitive “of hearing” [τοῦ ἀκοῦσαι] is used here to limit the meaning of “famine,” Smyth, § 2032, 1290.) The Lord’s dialogue with Israel is about to end, and the time for repentance is over; the Lord is the one sending this famine “upon the land.” (“Land” [γῆ] must refer to the land of Israel in this context, cf. 8:8, 9.) Israel did not want to seek the Lord (5:4–5, 14) or listen to his prophets (2:11–12; 7:9–17); as a result, even if they seek the Lord in the days of judgment, there will be no word from him. “The word of the Lord” could refer to both prophetic revelation and the Mosaic Law, since “prophetic revelation is based in and on the Law” (Stuart, 386). Other prophets also spoke about the Lord abandoning his people with no prophetic word from him (Hos 3:4; Lam 2:9; Ezek 7:26). See Deut 8:3 on the human need for God’s word. There was awareness in the Second Temple period that there was no prophet from the Lord, and there was an expectation of an authoritative prophet (1 Macc 4:46; cf. Deut 18:18; Mal 4:5).

The first clause of 8:12 employs the verb σαλεύω, which is commonly used for earthquake-like activity in the LXX (6 of 7 × it occurs in the Twelve; see

also Amos 9:5; Mic 1:4; Nah 1:5; Hab 3:6; Zech 12:2; Nah 3:12 is less clear). Thus, in 8:12a the LXX returns to the Lord's judgment by his intervention in nature (cf. 8:8, 9).

The last two clauses in 8:12 revisit the theme of 8:11. The running around "in search of the word of the Lord" is "from north to east"; this unusual expression where one would expect "north to south" might be taken to imply that the word of the Lord could still be found in the south (i.e., Judah; see Paul, 266). Regardless of the directions used, the point is clear: the people "will never find" a word from the Lord. The LXX uses the adverbial participle of purpose (ζητοῦντες), and the negation in the last clause is the strongest possible (Smyth, § 2754–2755).

Verses 13–14 conclude the development that began in 8:4 following the fourth vision. These verses depict events that will happen "in that day" (2:16; 8:3, 9; 9:11), the Day of the Lord. The main question in 8:13 is whether the young men and women "faint" spiritually in their thirst for the word of the Lord or physically in thirst for water. The reference to an earthquake-like activity in 8:12 opens the possibility for more than spiritual thirst in the context, and 8:13 says nothing to indicate the language is to be taken metaphorically. (Nothing should be made of the two different words for "thirst" used in 8:11 [διψα] and 8:13 [διψος]; they are synonyms and perhaps alternated here for literary variation; see LSJ, 439–440; Mur, 131.) Furthermore, the imagery of "young virgins" and "young men" who are in their physical prime indicates the fainting is physical; even the strongest will not be able to endure the judgments of that day. (The Targum interestingly applies 8:13 to the whole nation, which is like beautiful maidens in their prime who fornicate with wicked young men.) However, the apparent continuation of the description of the same people in 8:14 suggests this is more than simply physical thirst, because at the end of that verse they fall, never to rise again. The last clause in 8:14 is very similar to 5:2, which is contained in a funeral lament and states that the "virgin Israel" will never rise again (cf. the mention of Israelite "virgins" in 8:13). (On the inevitable end of Israel, see also 5:2–3; 7:8, and 8:2.)

The absence of a connector at the beginning of 8:14 indicates that the articular participle at the beginning of the verse ("those who swear") continues to describe the "young virgins" and "young men" of 8:13. The second articular participle in 8:14 indicates another group or a further description of the "young virgins" and "young men" ("those who say"). Those portrayed in the first clause swear κατὰ τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ Σαμαρείας. Here the oath of the people in question cannot be "against" (cf. 8:7) but rather must be "by" (cf. 4:2; 6:8) the object of their swearing, since the formula describes the object of their trust. The object of the oath is "the sin-offering of Samaria" (κατα τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ

Σαμαρείας). The term ἱλασμός can refer to atonement from sin (expiation, propitiation, forgiveness; Ps 129[130 MT]:4; Dan Th 9:9; Lev 25:9 referring to the Day of “Atonement”; in 1 Chron 28:20 τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ referring to the Holy of Holies in some mss) or the means of the atonement, the sin-offering (2 Macc 3:33; Ezek 44:27; and probably Num 5:8). (See TDNT 3:300–323 on the ἱλάσκομαι word family; Dines 255–257 has a thorough discussion of ἱλασμός in Amos 8:14.) I have used the more concrete translation “sin-offering,” which here must be an ironic reference to the religious ritual in “Samaria” (see the references to false worship in the rest of the verse; Glenn, 173–174), rather than the more abstract “atonement.”

What then does it mean to “swear by the sin-offering of Samaria”? Elsewhere in Amos (3:9, 12; 4:1; 6:1) “Samaria” describes the city, not the nation, and it is reasonable to understand it that way here. (It is true that Bethel is missing from the list of sanctuaries in this passage, suggesting Samaria has a broader reference, but Gilgal is also missing; cf. 4:4 and 5:5.) Ahab constructed a Baal temple in Samaria (3 Kgdms 16:32–33), and there would have been Seleucid worship there in the second century BCE (see 6:1). The ironic, even sarcastic, reference to the “sin-offering of Samaria” must be a condemnation of the religious practices there, which the translator views as at best heterodox and almost certainly idolatrous (Dines, 256). The oaths of loyalty to the gods of Samaria are a defection from the Lord and are utterly worthless.

As mentioned above, the second articular participle in 8:14 indicates another group or a further description of the “young virgins” and “young men” (i.e., “those who say”). The people in question are at the very least saying that the gods of Dan and Bersabee are living (ζῆ ὁ θεός σου). The question is whether the verb in the two formulas (ζῆ ὁ θεός σου) is indicative or subjunctive. If the verbs are indicative, the sentences are statements of faith or acclamation (so Brenton and NETS; cf. Ps 17[18 MT]:47; 2 Kgdms 22:47). If they are subjunctive, the sentences are a common oath formula, “as your god lives” (so Dines, 255; cf. Ruth 3:13). There are only two other modified oath formulas in the Twelve (Hos 4:15; Zeph 2:9). The use of οἱ λέγοντες to introduce this statement might suggest it is an acclamation, but since oath formulas are more common in Scripture (there are no other acclamations in the Twelve) and the preceding clause refers to an oath (οἱ ὀμνύοντες), it is more likely the verbs are to be taken as subjunctives and the statements taken as oath formulas. Thus, the people in question swear by the gods of Dan and Bersabee, invoking the gods of those places to guarantee their promises. Dines rightly concludes that whether the statements are acclamations or oath formulas the expression is idolatrous and a “contradiction in terms” parallel

to swearing “by the sin-offering of Samaria” (see her fuller discussion of this issue, p. 257). The reference to “your god” (2×) surely points to idolatry, and the LXX reader would likely understand this passage to refer to the Seleucid and Samaritan religious influences in Samaria (see discussion at 6:1).

It is noteworthy that in 5:5 the LXX translated Beersheba as “the well of the oath,” but in 8:14 it transliterates the place-name. This difference in translation plays a factor in the discussion of the number of translators of LXX-Amos. Howard (109) employs this difference to support his hypothesis that 8:12–9:10 is an independent translation. Muraoka (“Is the Septuagint Amos VIII 12–IX 10 a separate unit?,” 497–498) responded by noting Beersheba is also translated (“well of the oath”) in Gen 26:33 and 21:31, where it plays a central role, and he suggests that perhaps those for whom Amos was translated did not realize Beersheba was a cult center like Bethel and Gilgal and so the translator made that clear by employing words with cultic connotations in 5:5; in 8:14 it was not necessary to so render the name because of the mention of “those who swear” in the opening of the verse. Dines (259) suggests (without further explanation) that the sentence structure in 5:5 allows for the paraphrase and possible word play; she also notes that the two passages “show the translator’s ability to extract the full potential of his text (rather like a double translation, but several chapters apart!).”

Both Dan and Beersheba were occupied in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, and there is archaeological evidence that there was a sanctuary at Dan through the Roman period (see ABD, 2:16) and at Beersheba (probably under the control of the Idumeans) in the Hellenistic period (ABD, 1:645; Aharoni, 1974, 270–272; Dines, 259). Dines (259) concludes that for the readers of the LXX “both places could have still been quite potent symbols of Israel’s infidelity and doom.”

The mention of oath formulae involving Dan and Beersheba geographically encompasses, like a merism, all the shrines of the northern kingdom of Israel. They are all condemned, and the last clause of the section predicts that those who worship and reverence the gods of these shrines will fall and never rise again. On the total collapse of the northern kingdom, see 5:2; 7:8; 8:2 and 14.

The last clause in 8:14 literally refers to individuals who will “never rise again.” With the development of ideas concerning personal resurrection in the Second Temple period, some suggest that passages like this take on that nuance when translated into Greek, especially with the verb ἀνίστημι, as here in 8:14 (see Ackroyd and Schaper). Normally in Amos ἀνίστημι is used to describe the nation (5:2 [2×] “the virgin of Israel”; 7:2, 5 “Iakob”; 9:11 [2×] “the tabernacle of David”), and once it refers to the Lord rising up with a

sword against the nation in judgment (7:9). In 5:2 Israel is “fallen” not to rise again. In 7:2 and 5 Amos is afraid Israel will not be able to rise again because he is so “small in number.” None of the other contexts in Amos that uses ἀνίστημι is a clear reference to a hope of resurrection. The use of the term to describe individuals in 8:14 is different from the other uses in Amos in that regard and could suggest the possibility of personal future resurrection to a reader of the LXX. Also, the negative application of the concept to apostates, who worship other gods, would especially reinforce the seriousness of their religious apostasy, if it refers to their loss of any hope of eschatological resurrection. (On the hope of resurrection in the LXX see esp. 2 Macc 7:9, 11, 14; 12:44–45; Job 14:14; 19:25; Isa 26:14, 19; Dan. 12:2; cf. Wis 3.) However, each time this Greek verb occurs in Amos (8×; see also 5:2 [2×]; 7:2, 5, 9; 9:11 [2×]) it renders the Hebrew verb קָם, as it almost invariably does in the LXX, and the almost invariable translation of קָם by ἀνίστημι in the LXX (as here) makes it impossible to be confident that the translator intended a reference to bodily resurrection. Furthermore, the use of ἀνίστημι in so many other ways in the LXX also raises doubts whether a Greek reader would understand it to refer to bodily resurrection in this text.

A Vision of the Destruction of the Temple and the People, 9:1–6

There are two main parts to this paragraph: a vision with its interpretation (9:1–4) and a hymn (9:5–6; cf. 4:13; 5:7–9). The vision *per se* includes a very brief description of the Lord standing on the altar in the first sentence; it is followed by two commands that he makes, apparently from that position. In his interpretation of the vision (a first-person monologue in 9:1b–4) the Lord states that no one in Israel will escape his judgment (9:1b; cf. “sons of Israel” and “Israel” in 9:7) and then explains why (9:2–4). The two parts of the Lord’s interpretation of the vision are connected by references to a “sword” (9:1b, 4). The Lord’s interpretation of the vision in 9:1b–4 (i.e., no one will escape the judgment) is supported by the hymn, which presents a powerful and fearful image of the Lord (9:5–6).

This final vision does not have the lengthy introductory formula of the preceding four visions (οὕτως ἔδειξέν μοι κύριος καὶ ἰδοὺ); in the final vision the prophet simply reports what he “saw.” Also there is no dialogue between the prophet and the Lord connected with this vision, but instead the Lord explains the vision in a monologue. Thus, in this vision the prophet’s role is diminished, and the Lord is more prominent. Since the “end” of Israel has already been announced in the fourth vision (8:2), the added dimension in this vision is that no one will escape the coming judgment.

The content of the vision is “the Lord standing upon the altar” (see Glenny, 186 and 194, on the anthropomorphic language here). Following ἐφίστημι the preposition ἐπὶ with the genitive can have several ideas (“on” or “upon” Num 14:14; “at” or “by” Gen 24:43; Num 23:17; Obad 14; “over” Num 23:6; Sir 23:2), depending on the context. “On” (Brenton, NETS; or “upon,” Dines, 261–262) is the more common understanding of the preposition with the genitive (BDF, § 234, [1]; see the discussion at 7:7). “The altar” (τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου) could refer to an illegitimate altar (2:8; 3:14 [2×]) but the term usually refers to an altar of the true God (LEH, 210; see the discussion at 7:9). Although the message of Amos is focused especially on the northern kingdom (see 3:14; 5:5; 7:9–17; 8:14), the appearance of the Lord near an altar in a sanctuary would naturally be associated with the Jerusalem temple in Judean theology (see below and 2:8).

The Lord makes two commands, which clarify his purpose “upon the altar.” He is there to judge the temple and the worshippers in it. The recipient of the command is not identified. The first command is noteworthy for two reasons. First, the prepositional phrase (ἐπὶ τὸ ἱλαστήριον) following πατάσσω is difficult to translate. It could be the idea of slay (someone) near the place of propitiation, strike the place of propitiation (taking the prepositional phrase as a direct object), or strike (a blow) against the place of propitiation. Despite it being un-idiomatic Greek the Patristic commentators take the prepositional phrase as a direct object (Dines, 262). The last two ideas are similar, and it is clear that the action is directed against the place of propitiation (Mur, 210, 443). I understand the preposition to indicate “hostile action” (Mur, 210), and I understand the idea to be similar to the close parallel in Jonah 4:8, “the sun smote ‘on the head’ [ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν] of Jonah,” where the prepositional phrase could be taken as the object of the verb or as indicating the direction of the action. I think it is closer to the latter in Amos 9:1, which is a more literal rendering of the phrase (see the discussion in Dines, 261–262).

The “place of propitiation” (ἱλαστήριον) is the object of the Lord’s attack. (On this translation see Paul, 274, n. 10; Stuart, 389; Arieti, 63; Dines, 263–268.) Normally in the LXX ἱλαστήριον refers to the golden cover on top of the ark (“mercy seat”) in the Holy of Holies. In the first of its twenty-eight occurrences in the LXX ἱλαστήριον appears in the phrase ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα (“atoning cover”), functioning as an adjective (Exod 25:17; so also 4 Macc 17:22). Always after that when it refers to the “mercy seat” or “golden cover on top of the ark” it is simply ἱλαστήριον (20× besides Amos 9:1). And after its first occurrence it always functions as a noun, with the exception of 4 Macc 17:22. It is possible that a LXX reader would not understand ἱλαστήριον to refer to the mercy seat, because five times in Ezek it refers to the ledges on

the altar in Ezekiel's temple (43:14 [3 ×], 17, 20), and the term has a broader usage in Greek (LSJ, 828). However, because of the Lord's presence in the temple in 9:1 and the frequent use of the word ἱλαστήριον elsewhere in the LXX to refer to the mercy seat, it would probably be understood to refer to the mercy seat or "the place of propitiation."

Thus, in the LXX the sanctuary in 9:1 is apparently the temple in Jerusalem. The prophecy refers to the most sacred element in the most sacred place (Dines, 263–264). Even the Patristic commentators, who did not understand ἱλαστήριον to refer to the cover on the ark in the Holy of Holies, understood the sanctuary described in 9:1 to be the Jerusalem temple (with the exception of Cyril; Dines, 267; see also Chrysostom, *Against the Anomoeans*, Homily 4.18–19).

When the mysterious recipient of the Lord's command strikes the place of propitiation, "the gateways will be shaken." There is a cause and effect relationship between these actions; the blow directed at the place of propitiation is so forceful that the sanctuary shakes all the way to its entrance. The imagery suggests an earthquake (cf. 9:5). The architectural term τὰ πρὸ πυλᾶ ("gateways"; synonymous with τὰ προπύλαια), which only occurs here and in Zeph 1:9 in the LXX, commonly refers to the gateways or entrances to both Egyptian and Greek temples (Herodotus, *Hist.* 2.63, 101, 121; 5.77; LSJ, 1496).

The Lord's second command is unclear in the LXX (Paul, 275–276). The Greek verb (διακόπτω) has the sense of "cut through, break through" (LSJ, 398; Mur, 116). It is used in the LXX and other Greek literature for breaking through an enemy's line in battle (2 Kgdms 6:8; 4 Kgdms 3:26; 2 Macc 10:30, 36; Jer 52:7), and it is often used in the LXX to describe a theophany (2 Kgdms 5:20; 6:8; 15:13; Ps. 28[29 MT]:7). It is a strong word that "is associated with particularly violent moments in human warfare and divine intervention" (Dines, 266). The verb is employed in Hab 3:14 in a context similar to Amos 9:1; there God cuts asunder the heads of princes that are his enemies (διέκοψας ... κεφαλὰς δυναστῶν), and the next clause has the verb σείω (cf. the previous clause in Amos 9:1).

The biggest issue with the meaning of διακόπτω in Amos 9:1 is the unusual use of εἰς following it, which could have the sense "into" ("cut through into (onto) the heads"; so Dines, 261 and Brenton) or it could denote the object of the verb ("cut through the heads"; so Mur, 116; NETS). Mur (116) has a separate category of meaning for διακόπτω with εἰς τι and suggests that is the usage in Amos 9:1 (he translates, "cut through the heads of all"; similarly Wolff, 335, n. e; Park, 162; cf. Hab 3:14). According to this understanding the Lord is commanding his agent to cut through the heads of people (so Mur, 316).

In Amos 9:1b the Lord summarizes his judgment of his people. The mention of “survivors of them” in 9:1b (καταλοίπους αὐτῶν) is another indication that the LXX is speaking of human “heads” in 9:1. That the Lord slays the survivors with a “sword” implies military defeat. The references to “slay” and “sword” in 9:1b and 4a (same Greek words in both verses) form an *inclusio* around the Lord’s monologue that interprets the vision. No one who survives the judgment in the temple will escape the sword or save himself; the last two clauses of 9:1 state this emphatically.

Verses 2–4a present several hypothetical situations to emphasize that no one will escape the Lord’s judgment, no matter what extreme measures they might attempt. In 9:4b the Lord concludes this section with a strong affirmation that he will “firmly set” his “eyes” on them; similar idioms express the turning of one’s attention to something or someone (Gen 44:21; Ezek 20:24; Ps 118[119 MT]:6, 15; Luke 4:20), and here the Lord fixes his attention on Israel for the purpose of judgment. The anthropomorphic expression, representing the Lord’s omniscience, forms a natural transition to the doxology in 9:5–6.

The series of five parallel conditional clauses in 9:2–4a demonstrates the impossibility of escaping the Lord. The first four conditions portray extreme and even senseless attempts to escape. The first suggests the possibility of people burrowing down to inaccessible Hades, the lowest place imaginable, to escape the Lord’s judgment. (Hades should be understood as the underworld, which is “the temporary realm of the dead between death and the general resurrection at the end of the age” [ABD, 3:14].) This will do no good, because the Lord’s hand (representing his power and authority) can drag people up from there. At the other extreme, if they could do the impossible and ascend to heaven, the highest place imaginable, the Lord can bring them down from there.

While the first set of conditionals (9:2) gives possibilities that transcend the realm of the living and extend to the farthest parts of the cosmos, the second set of conditionals (9:3) contrasts the highest and lowest places that a person living in Israel would ever have imagined reaching on the earth, the “summit of Carmel” and the “depths of the sea.” In neither geographical extremity will people escape the judgment of the Lord. The lofty summit of Carmel (1,800 feet above sea level) is an appropriate example because of its dense forests and hundreds of limestone caves (3Kgdms 18:4) and because it was considered to be the property of Baal (3Kgdms 18:17–36). The depths of the sea are portrayed in Scripture as “the deified powers of chaos” (Ps 73:13–14; Job 7:12) and the “dragon” is often the “embodiment of the sea’s inimical powers” (Wolff, 341; Job 26:12–13; Isa 27:1). (See Glenny, 198, and Satterthwaite, 16, on the reverential language in 9:3.)

“Dragon” (δράκων) is employed by the LXX translators twenty-six times. In the LXX the “dragon” is sometimes the sea personified in a dragon of chaos (Job 7:12), a many-headed dragon that God destroys by smashing its heads (Ps 73:13–14), or an apostate (Job 26:13). Sometimes it is called Nebuchadnezzar (Jer 28:34) and sometimes Pharaoh (Ezek 29:3; 32:2). The word is employed four times in *Bel and the Dragon* to describe the dragon (23, 25, 27, and 28 in both LXX and Th). Foerster suggests that in several of its occurrences in the LXX, including Amos 9:3, the early Christians would have understood δράκων to refer to Satan, especially in Ps 73:13–14 (TDNT, 2:283, quoting G. Bertram; see Ezek 29:3; 32:2; Isa 27:1; Pss 103:25–26; 148:7; Job 26:13). In Amos 9:3 the “dragon” is under the Lord’s dominion, and the Lord assigns him to execute his retributive judgment in the most remote depths of the sea.

In 9:4a the Lord employs another agent, the sword, to serve his bidding and to execute his retributive judgment. This last of five conditional sentences is clearly the point of the series; if one cannot escape the Lord’s judgment in heaven or Hades, on the summit of Carmel or in the depth of the sea, then one will not escape it in captivity either. No geographical realm is outside of the sovereign control of the Lord of Israel, and exile offers no protection from judgment. The personified “sword” (ρόμφαίλα), which is the Lord’s agent, represents warfare, bloodshed, and violence (see also Amos 1:11; 4:10; 7:9, 11, 17; 9:1, 10). The Greek phrase πρὸ προσώπου τῶν ἐχθρῶν αὐτῶν is difficult to translate. Dines (270) has “in the sight of their enemies,” Brenton renders it “before the face of their enemies,” and Mur (13) suggests “ahead of their enemies.” The latter understanding is preferred (so also NETS), because the idea of “face” or “sight” is not required here and gives an awkward sense to the phrase.

The five conditional sentences in 9:2–4b function together to build a strong argument, which comes to its conclusion in the fifth condition in 9:4a. The five conditions in Amos 9:2–4a are presented as open possibilities (all future, more vivid conditions with the aorist subjunctive, Smyth, § 2323–2326), and the apodosis follows if the protasis is true (Smyth, § 2280). The first four protases are clearly unlikely and hyperbolic but are used to develop the argument of the passage. They present situations in which one would think the subjects would be able to escape the Lord’s judgment. However, even in those seemingly impossible situations (conditions) people do not escape. In the final condition in 9:4a, the protasis is clearly possible (to go into captivity), and it contains the main point of the passage. If people could not escape from the Lord’s judgment in the previous four hypothetical situations, it is clear they will not escape it in the last. Thus, there is no way for Israel to escape the Lord’s judgment.

Amos 9:4b emphasizes the Lord's commitment and determination to punish Israel. The Lord will determinedly fix his attention on them (στηρίζω) for judgment (see Jer 24:6 for the use of the same clause in a positive sense). Also, note the plurals (κακὰ ... ἀγαθὰ) with the translation, "for the purpose of calamities and not good things." The phrase probably has the sense of "to their disadvantage and not to their advantage" (see Mur, 1). Stating things twice, positively and negatively to emphasize the point, is a common characteristic in Amos (5:2, 4–5, 14, 15, 18, 20; 8:11).

The hymn in 9:5–6 constitutes the second part of the paragraph 9:1–6. Note the other two hymns in 4:13 and 5:7–9. Each hymn follows a threat of retributive judgment and affirms that the Lord has the power to accomplish his threat (Paul, 280). All of these hymns glorify the Lord's majesty and power. In this hymn the Lord named at its beginning and end is the same Lord as in the preceding vision (9:1); he is the focus of the hymn. Verse 5 describes the Lord's judgment of the earth.

See the textual notes on the name for God in 9:5a. This is the only time this exact divine name (κύριος κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ) is used in LXX-Amos. The verb "take hold of" (ἐφάπτω) only appears three times in the LXX, always in the middle voice (see also 6:3 where it occurs in a doublet with ἐγγίζω and 2 Macc 7:1). Here it is a participle, the common verbal form in the doxologies in Amos. Although, it could have the idea "touch," normal Greek usage suggests it would have a stronger sense. (It generally means "lay violent hands upon" in the middle voice, LSJ, 741; see also Mur, 242.) The "land" (γῆ) in 9:5 must be the land of Israel; this is clear from the following context (cf. 8:8, which is parallel and also refers to the land of Israel). In this verse the Lord "shakes" the land; in the other occurrence of this verb (σαλεύω) in Amos "the waters of the sea will be shaken violently" (8:12; cf. σείω in 1:14 [of Ammon] and 9:1 [of "the gateways"]).

The consequences of the Lord shaking the land in 9:5 ("so that"; on this use of καί see Mur, 281) are given in the remainder of the verse (see the parallels in 1:14 and esp. 8:8, which is identical to 9:5b with only one exception, the pronoun αὐτῆς in 9:5b): all the inhabitants will mourn and the destruction of the land will be like the rising and falling of the Nile.

The doxology continues in 9:6 with a series of four more participle phrases and concludes with a declaration of the Lord's name (see also 4:13 and 5:8) forming a chiasm with the divine name at the beginning of the doxology in 9:5a. Occurrences of the word ἐπαγγελία ("promise") are fairly limited in the LXX (8×), and this is the only time it is employed to render the rare Hebrew word to which it corresponds; thus it may reflect the theology of the translator (Glenny, 83–84). That the Lord "establishes his promise" seems to

focus on his faithfulness or covenant (Pr Man 6); it could refer especially to his faithfulness to Israel, if the phrase ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς refers to the land of Israel (i.e., he “establishes his promise in the land”). This prepositional phrase (with the object in the genitive or accusative) refers to both the earth in general (3:5 [2×]; 8:9; 9:9) and the land of Israel (3:14; 5:2; 8:11; 9:15) in Amos. (On this phrase see van der Kooij “The Old Greek of Isaiah 19:16–25,” 149.) This context, with “heaven” in the first line and with a general reference to “the face of the earth” following (τῆς γῆς in 9:5b), requires a broader reference for the phrase, i.e., “on the earth.” This fits well with the emphasis of the Lord’s sovereignty over all the nations in this section (9:7, 12, 15b).

According to 9:6 the Lord is connected with “earth”; he is building an ascent up from the earth to heaven and establishing his promise on earth (see also the LXX rendering of 4:13, “proclaims to men his anointed” and 5:7b, “established justice on the earth”). The doxologies in LXX-Amos present a picture of a God who is immanent.

The remainder of verse 6 (the last two participle phrases and the description of the Lord) is exactly the same as 5:8b in the second doxology; see the discussion there. Παντοκράτωρ in the declaration of the Lord’s name at the end of the doxology emphasizes his might and power, a key theme in LXX-Amos (see 9:15), and matches the divine title at the beginning of the doxology (9:5a).

The Lord Will Judge the Sinners in Israel, 9:7–10

In this paragraph the Lord speaks in the first person of his absolute control of all of the nations. Israel is not exempt from judgment any more than the other nations are, and no sinner in Israel will escape the coming judgment. However, as in previous passages of Amos, the Lord gives some hope for his people (see 5:14–15): a remnant will survive the Lord’s judgment (9:8b). The paragraph begins with two rhetorical questions in 9:7. These questions are meant to teach Israel that they are as vulnerable as those nations from which they thought the Lord was going to protect them, and that the exodus from Egypt (their election) does not exempt them from judgment. The first rhetorical question compares Israel’s relationship with the Lord to that of the distant, relatively obscure Ethiopians, south of Egypt. The second question stresses that Israel is not the only nation that the Lord has led to their land in an “exodus-like” experience. He has been in control of the history of the other nations also, like their enemies the Philistines and Syrians. The Lord led the Philistines up from Cappadocia (also found in Targum, Vulgate, and Syriac; the MT has Caphtor; see Glenny, 174–176). Some feel the Philistines originated

from Crete (Wolff, 347–348), some feel they originated from Cappadocia in Asia Minor (Cripps, 263), and some allow that Caphtor might refer to both places (Stuart, 390). The OT testimony to their origin is not uniform. In Deut 2:23 and Amos 9:7 the Philistines are identified with Caphtor in the MT and Cappadocia in the LXX, although there is no explicit reference to the Philistines in Deut 2:23 (see also Gen 10:14; Jer 29[47 MT]:4 in which their origin is connected with an island; cf. Zeph 2:5; Ezek 25:16). Amos 9:7 is the only place where the Philistines are explicitly said to come from Caphtor (MT) and Cappadocia (LXX).

If the translation of Amos was made in the second half of the second-century, the mention of the Philistines might have caused a reaction. The Philistines were allies of the Syrians during the Maccabean Revolt (1 Macc 3:41), and the Maccabees made campaigns and reprisals against the Philistines (1 Macc 6:66–68; 11:61–62; see also the second-century evidence in Jubilees 24:27–33, where the Philistines are called the “Caphtorim”). See also 1 Macc 10:77–87; 16:10; and Josephus, *A.J.* 13.356–364 for evidence that the Maccabean campaigns against the Philistines continued into the Hasmonean period. Dines (273–274) raises the possibility that “the menace of these ancestral enemies could well have been reinforced by a reference to Cappadocia.” The Seleucids were interested in Cappadocia because the overland routes to their possessions in western Asia Minor traversed it. Thus, they developed friendly relations with Cappadocia, involving at least one dynastic marriage. Dines suggests that the “close alliance between Seleucids and Cappadocians would have marked out the latter as supporters of a tyrannical regime hostile to Jewish interests.”

Even more complicated is the phrase at the end of 9:7 describing the place from which the Lord brought up the Syrians: “out of the pit” (ἐκ βόθρου; see Glenny, 64–67). The noun βόθρος (22 × in the LXX) is a word with cultic sacrificial connotations in secular Greek; in the worship of the gods of the underworld the βόθρος takes the place of the altar, or βώμος (Homer, *Od.* X, 517; LSJ, 320). In LXX Ezek (and 1 × in Sir) βόθρος represents the depths of the earth, which is the place of the “uncircumcised” dead, like the princes of Assur and the Pharaoh (26:20; 31:14; 32:18, 21, 24, 29, 30; also Sir 21:10). Elsewhere in the LXX it is also a pit deliberately dug as a trap (most often in Pss and wisdom literature, i.e., Sir 27:26; Ps 7:15; Prov 22:14) or a place of refuge (1 Kgdms 13:6).

Dines discusses extensively (274–282) whether βόθρος should be understood as a common noun (“pit”) or a proper noun balancing “Egypt” and “Cappadocia” in 9:7. Several factors favor the second option: (1) it is parallel to “Egypt” and “Cappadocia,” thus apparently another geographical location;

(2) one main verb (ἀνάγω) and one negative (οὐ) are used throughout the verse for three objects, suggesting they are parallel; (3) and when βόθρος is a Sheol-like pit in Ezek and Sir it is always a place that people go into, not a place they come out of. The first option also has several things in its favor: (1) the most natural meaning of the word βόθρος is pit, and it is used of Sheol in Ezek and Sir; (2) there is evidence of a belief in the opening up of the underworld as part of the last times in the eschatology of the Second Temple period (1QH III 12–18; cf. Rev 9:3 and 20:1–3; see Dines, 277); (3) and there is evidence of such anti-Syrian polemic elsewhere in LXX-Amos (1:5; 3:12). This sort of language is certainly no more strange than portraying Gog as the king of the locusts (7:1); in fact it is similar.

The evidence for interpreting βόθρος as a geographical term is not strong enough to overthrow the support for understanding it as a proper noun here. In fact, the arguments for both can be reconciled. The translator is making all three nations (Israel, the Philistines, and the Syrians) parallel; the sovereign Lord has controlled the past history of all of them and placed them where they are. At the same time the Syrians have their origin in “the pit” and in that regard differ from the other nations, even the Philistines. They have come from the underworld and in a sense are “sons of the pit,” “sons of Sheol,” or reprobates (as the wicked are described in CD VI 15).

In 9:8 the “eyes” of the Lord from which no one can escape (9:4) are “upon the kingdom of the sinners.” (The preposition ἐπί could mean “against” here, as in the similar phrase at the end of 9:4, but it is less likely here.) In the context of several nations (9:7), the “kingdom of the sinners” could be any nation, including Israel. Based on 1:3–2:16, the sovereign Lord God controls the destiny of the nations, enforcing universal moral standards. If the people of a nation are sinners and do not abide by his ethical standards, the Lord will destroy them. However, there is one reservation: the Lord will not completely destroy the “house of Jacob.” The “house of Jacob” must refer to ethnic Israel, and thus, a remnant of the people of Israel who are not “sinners” will survive (see 5:14–15).

Verse 9 deserves more attention than space allows (see Dines, 283–293 for more detailed discussion of the vocabulary). This verse explains the discriminating destruction of 9:8 (introductory διότι). The Lord will command (future present tense), and then he will “winnow the house of Israel among the nations.” This must mean that what he commands he causes to happen through the agency of others.

The verb λικμάω (“winnow” at least 17 × in the LXX) is used literally in the LXX for the separating of the grain from the chaff by throwing it in the air so the chaff blows away and the grain falls to the ground (Ruth 3:2; Sir

5:9; Isa 30:24); winnowing was the third step in harvesting grain (see Ruth 2–3), following the cutting of the grain and the threshing of it (Isa 28:27–28; Deut 25:4). However, the verb was employed metaphorically in the LXX to describe punishment by scattering or destruction more often than it was used literally (Spicq, 2:401–402; Dines, 284). The imagery often describes divine retribution (toward Israel, Jer 38[31 MT]:10; Ezek 36:19; and toward other nations, Isa 17:13; Jer 30[49 MT]:32; Ezek 26:4; 29:12). It was also used to describe Israel's winnowing of the nations (Isa 30:22; 41:16). Jer 38[31 MT]:10 is similar to Amos 9:9; both passages are eschatologically oriented and connect the Lord's winnowing of Israel with Israel's salvation.

The winnowing of Israel “among the nations” in LXX-Amos 9:9 refers to the Lord's work among the exiles. The “house of Israel” must refer to the ethnic unit of Israelites (both northern and southern kingdoms) as “house of Iakob” does in 9:8. Here the imagery of winnowing seems to be different than elsewhere in the LXX, where it refers to scattering and destroying people like chaff. The following context requires that in this sentence the winnowing of “the house of Israel” is to salvage the remaining valuable grain in “the house of Israel” that is found “among the nations.” Thus, in this context the exiles who are not “sinners” are the good grain, not the bad chaff. This is consistent with 9:8b, 10, and Jer 38[31 MT]:10.

Dines (286–289) has a thorough discussion of “destruction” (σύντριμμα = συντριμμός, LSJ, 1729; cf. Mur, 540–541 who understands the two words to have different meanings in the LXX). Three times in Lam the phrase σύντριμμα τῆς θυγατρὸς τοῦ λαοῦ μου refers to the horrors of the siege and fall of Jerusalem (2:11; 3:48; and 4:10 with the last article omitted; see also Isa 22:4). Interestingly, in 1 Macc 2:7 τὸ σύντριμμα τοῦ λαοῦ μου describes the sufferings of the Jews resisting Antiochus Epiphanes, and τὸ σύντριμμα τῆς ἀγίας πόλεως refers to the defiling of the temple. Dines (288) summarizes that as a destruction word σύντριμμα (cf. συντριβῶ) conveys “an impression of an event or situation of far reaching doom. It evokes an atmosphere, rather than describes a precise scene.”

It is very unlikely that σύντριμμα would be understood as a “pebble” or “kernel” of grain in 9:9 (cf. Mur, 540; NETS). The context and use of the word elsewhere in the LXX suggest σύντριμμα means something like “destruction, ruin” in Amos 9:9, resulting in our translation, “destruction shall never fall upon the land.” The “destruction” could refer to a person, such as an oppressor, the overthrow or defeat of the nation, or any number of other tragedies.

The phrase “fall upon the land [earth]” could have a number of meanings in the LXX, including several that do not fit here (do obeisance, fall on the earth in death or birth, and fall unconscious, Dines, 289–290). More to the

point in 9:9 the idea of not falling to the earth could have the idea that the destruction will be effective (1 Kgdms 3:19; 14:45; cf. 1 Kgdms 26:20; 2 Kgdms 14:11; 3 Kgdms 1:52). Or it could mean that the destruction will not pose a threat, if “fall to the land [earth]” is a negative idea (2 Kgdms 17:12; Ps 139[140 MT]:11; Job 1:16 in A; Amos 3:14; Ezek 38:20). The wider distribution of the latter understanding of the phrase, including one such use in Amos, supports such an understanding of it in Amos 9:9. Thus, the last clause is “a confident oracle of salvation” (Dines, 289) that destruction will never again fall on the land to afflict it and its inhabitants. After the time of exile and punishment, the Lord promises the true remnant of Israel a new era of freedom and peaceful occupation of the land; there will be no more destruction and punishment. Another support for such an understanding of 9:9b is that it places the content of this oracle “firmly within the mainline post-exilic prophetic and eschatological thinking” (Dines, 289), and it is consistent with the message of 9:11–15 (esp. Amos 9:15; Isa 61:12–22; Zech 14:11). (W adds a clause in 9:9 from 9:11 [τὰ πεπτωκότα αὐτῆς καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς ἀναστήσω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω], connecting it with the promises of restoration and rebuilding there.)

Verse 10 makes it absolutely clear that the “sinners of my people,” apparently the sinners among the house of Jacob, will be judged and perish by the sword of the Lord. (See 9:1 and 4 on the sword [ῥομφαία], as the Lord’s agent of destruction.) The “sinners” are those who ignore Amos’ message and are complacent and presumptuous because of the Lord’s past deliverance (9:7). They are identified by their exact words: “Calamities will never approach or come upon us.” The LXX has the emphatic double negative with each verb, thus intensifying the rhetoric (Satterthwaite, 6; de Waard, “Translation Techniques,” 347; see also 4:6–11 and 7:1–6). This judgment of the “sinners of my people” implies that there will be a remnant (9:8–9). The neuter plural, “calamities,” or acts of evil (τὰ κακά) points to specific acts of evil. The translator normally handles such abstract nouns in this way (see 9:4). (See Glenny, 212–216, on the eschatological emphasis of 9:9–10.)

In 9:7–10 it is clear that Israel’s sovereign Lord will judge them like all the other nations. The nation that is sinful as well as the sinners among the nation of Israel will all be judged. But the Lord is not going to destroy all the “house of Iakob.” A remnant among the people will survive the coming judgment, and verse 9 promises them security and freedom from their enemies and from the Lord’s enemies in the land after the exile and judgment are finished. This theme will be developed further in the last five verses of Amos.

*F. 9:11–15**The Restoration of the Kingdom of David, 9:11–12*

In Vaticanus 9:11–15 is the sixth and last major division of Amos, marked by a capital *digamma*. The first paragraph in this division (9:11–12) is a promise of blessing and restoration of the Davidic dynasty and kingdom as it was in the days of old. The introductory phrase “In that day” places the events in a future time of divine intervention in the affairs of the world; this future time also involves judgment before the blessing (see 8:3, 9, 11, 13). Amos 9:11–12 promises rebuilding after the Lord’s destructive judgment of the nation (Ezek 36:35–36). The four first person singular verbs in 9:11 emphatically state that it is the Lord who will do the rebuilding.

The LXX rendering of 9:11 is very polished (see Dines, 293–294 for a comparison with the less stylish MT; also Glenn, 217–218). The first and third verbs are identical (*ἀναστήσω*), as are the second and fourth (*ἀνοικοδομήσω*). The fourfold repetition of the prepositional prefix (*ανα-*) and the two perfect passive participles from *πίπτω* add to the assonance. As a chiasmic hub the verse contains the central phrases *τὰ πεπτωκότα αὐτῆς καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς*. The fourfold repetition of the prepositional prefix (*ανα-*) emphasizes rebuilding and restoration (Richard, 48).

The phrase *καθὼς αἰ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος* could refer to an idealized reign of David in the future or to the distant past, since the noun *αἰών* can refer to the past (Gen 6:4; Deut 32:7) or future (Gen 3:22; 6:3; Exod 14:13; Isa 13:20; 25:2; 48:12). The same phrase without the comparative (Sir 50:23 and Isa 63:9), and the exact phrase with the comparative (Mic 7:14 and Mal 3:4) all refer to the past. The context in Amos requires such an understanding in 9:11 also. Since it is “in that day,” i.e., in the future, that the Lord will restore the Davidic dynasty and rule, he will not be making it as it will be in the future, but as it was in the past.

The key term in the verse is the “tent” (*σκηνή*) of David that is to be restored and of which all the “collapsed” and “ruined” things in the verse are a part. This term (436 × in the LXX) describes a tent or hut, the tabernacle, or the feast of tabernacles. In Amos 5:26 it describes the portable sanctuary or tabernacle of Moloch, and in this passage it seems to be used metaphorically for the dynasty and kingdom of David. This understanding of it is supported by the parallel use in Isa 16:5 and the context of Amos 9:11, which seems to describe the divided and weakened state of Israel. Van der Kooij, “Septuagint of Zechariah” argues that the “tent of David” in 9:11 is Jerusalem, but that does not make sense with the purpose clause beginning 9:12; how would

the building of Jerusalem accomplish the purpose of gentiles seeking the Lord? (See Glenny, 218–224, on τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυιδ.) The verse promises a future restoration of David's dynasty and the kingdom over which it rules so that it will be like in former times. Note the similar understanding of the verse in 4Q174 1–3 I 12.

Amos 9:11 and 12 are quoted in Acts 15:16–17 where Luke seems to have adapted and condensed verse 11 to fit his purposes (Dines, 294–295; Richard, 47–48 and esp. Glenny, “The Septuagint and Apostolic Hermeneutics”); verse 12, by contrast, is quoted from the LXX with only slight variation. Amos 9:11 is also quoted (without 9:12) in CD VII 16 and in 4Q174 1–3 I 12 (see above). In the former the “tent of David” is taken as the books of the Law that will be reestablished and interpreted by an interpreter of the Law, who will be raised up to lead the nation; in the latter the “booth of David” refers to the “shoot of David,” who will arise to fulfill the Davidic covenant (4Kgdms 7) and deliver Israel. As mentioned above, such an eschatological, messianic interpretation of 4Q174 3:12 is similar to the text's meaning in Amos 9. Dines (296–300; see also Turner, 472–473) discusses the possibility that LXX-Dan 11:14 is dependent on Amos 9:11. If Amos 9:11 is the “prophecy” referred to in LXX-Dan 11:14, then it is one more example of a community for which this text was important and another understanding of the fulfillment of this text.

It is also possible that some might have understood Amos 9:11 to refer to the restoration of Jerusalem by Nehemiah or the rebuilding of the Temple by Joshua and Zerubbabel, who was the last descendant of David in the Old Testament. Sir 49:12 praises these last two characters because “they built the house [ῥκοδόμησαν οἶκον] and raised up a holy temple to the Lord.” The next verse praises Nehemiah, who “raised our fallen walls” (τοῦ ἐγείραντος ἡμῖν τείχη πεπτωκότα). There is nothing in LXX-Amos 9:11 to prove to whom the translator felt the passage referred, but readers of it could have applied the concepts in it to several different situations.

Several aspects of 9:12 deserve comment. First, the verb “may seek” does not have an object. However, it picks up again the theme of “seeking the Lord” (5:4, 6), and that earlier theme plus the immediate context suggest that the reader is to supply “me” (με), as several Lucianic mss and versions do; A has “the Lord,” influenced by Acts 15:17. Second, “the remnant of people and all the nations” suggests those non-Jews that remain in “that day” (9:11); “people” harkens back to 4:13, a messianic passage where ἄνθρωπος also refers to gentiles. Thus the verse indicates that people from all nations will turn to the Lord. Third, the concept of having God's name “called upon” someone is theologically rich. This technical construction (ἐπικαλεῖται τὸ ὄνομα τινος ἐπὶ τινά in the LXX, BDAG, 373) has the idea of ownership or control. It

indicates legal right of possession, and the name of the new owner is called over property when it is transferred from one owner to another (2 Kgdms 12:28; Isa 4:1; see NIDOTTE, 3:973). The Lord has authority over people and objects if his name is called over them (e.g., Israel in Deut 28:10; the ark in 2 Kgdms 6:2; Jeremiah in Jer 15:16; the temple in Jer 39[32 MT]:34; Jerusalem in Dan 9:18–19). To be called by God's name involves a relationship with him which gives the people so related the right to call upon him for help (Jer 14:9; 15:15–16) and the responsibility to be loyal to him (Deut 28:10). When the phrase is applied to Israel, as God's people, it has covenant connotations (Deut 28:10; 2 Chr 7:14). What is most striking about the use of the phrase in 9:12 is its application to gentiles; this is the only place it is so applied (Dines, 303). In Amos 9:12 gentiles from all nations, as gentiles, have the Lord's name called upon them and are the people of God. All people, including gentiles, upon whom the Lord's name is called are able and responsible to "seek" the Lord (9:12a; cf. 5:4, 6).

It is clear in 9:11–12 that the purpose for the Lord restoring and rebuilding the kingdom of David (9:11) is "so that" (ὅπως plus the subjunctive) gentiles may seek the Lord and be his people. Thus, the Lord is going to make himself known in the reestablishment of Israel so that gentiles may seek him. This restored Israel will be in Judah (Zech 14) and in the Diaspora (Isa 19:16–25, esp. 19:25; cf. Amos 9:14). Verse 12 ends by declaring that it is "the Lord, who accomplishes these things." He fulfills Davidic promises (9:11), and gentiles will seek him (Gen 12:3b); and they, as gentiles, will be his covenant people. (See Glenny, 217–228, on 9:11–12.)

This openness to gentiles would be very attractive to Jews in the Diaspora who sought to fit into their culture and show the attractiveness of their religion to the gentiles among whom they lived. Of course, it was because of this clear statement of the call of gentiles to be God's people that Amos 9:12 was cited in Acts 15:16–17.

The Restoration of the Land of Israel, 9:13–15

Amos 9:13–15, the last paragraph in LXX-Amos in B, describes a time of the Lord's future, direct intervention in Israel ("days are coming"). In the description of the land's fertility in 9:13 the "harvest" (ἀμνητος) overtakes, or lasts up to, the "vintage" (τρύγητος), or harvest, of grapes in the fall (see Walters, 95, 226–227). The latter term could refer to the harvest of grain also (see 4:7; Joel 1:11; LSJ, 1829), but that would not make as much sense, and the following context refers to grapes, which is its normal reference in the LXX (e.g., Lev 26:5; Judg 8:2; 2 Kgdms 8:12; Isa 24:13). Furthermore, the vocabulary

here is probably derived from the covenant promises in LXX-Lev 26:5 (where B has ἄμνητος), which promises that the harvest will last until the vintage and the vintage until the seedtime (see Wevers, *Leviticus*, 439). Thus, the spring grain harvest lasts until the harvest of grapes in the fall. The link with Lev 26:5 points to fulfillment of the blessings promised under the Mosaic covenant, and makes these blessings conditional on obedience to the “ordinances” and “commandments” of that covenant (Lev 26:3–4; see Park, 175).

In the next phrase the translator varies slightly from Lev 26:5, although a free translation of the Hebrew there or in Amos 9:13b could explain his translation; the idea of both Lev 26:5 and the MT of Amos 9:13b is that the vintage or treader of grapes overtakes the sower. However, the LXX of Amos 9:13 describes it differently, “the grapes will ripen at seedtime.” The term for “seedtime” (ὁ σπόρος) is also found in Lev 26:5; the only other place the LXX has the clause “grapes will ripen” (περκάσει ἡ σταφυλή) found in Amos 9:13 is in Sir 51:15, a context that does not shed much light on Amos 9:13. The point in the phrase in LXX-Amos 9:13 is that grapes will begin to ripen and mature very early and not require a complete growing season, because the land is so fertile and the conditions are so good. The time to plant grain, or “seedtime,” in Israel is in November and December, before the early rains (see ABD, 1:97), and in Egypt grain is planted at about the same time, after the Nile recedes (ABD, 4:1112–1113; Herodotus, *Hist.* 2.14). In either geographical context the text suggests an amazingly fast growth of grapes, which become ripe again in the late fall or early winter at the time grain is planted, apparently after the earlier fall grape harvest.

The third clause of 9:13, “and the mountains will drip [with] sweetness” (ἀποσταλάξει τὰ ὄρη γλυκασμόν), has the exact same vocabulary as Joel 3:18 (both translating the same Hebrew clause [4:18 MT]).

In the final clause of 9:13 the hills “will be thickly planted” (σύμφυτοι ἔσονται); this describes a land in which every hill will be thickly wooded or planted with crops. Grundmann claims σύμφυτος is a verbal adjective from συμφύομαι [συμφύω] meaning “to grow together”; thus, it means “native” or “bound together” and should be rendered here “the mountains shall grow together”; see TDNT, 7:786 and Park, 175. However, Greek usage suggests that it would be understood to have the idea of thickly planted or wooded (LSJ, 1689). This is consistent with the fact that there is an emphasis in 9:13–15 on the land being “planted”; note the threefold repetition of verbs related to φυτεύω in 9:14–15. The description of the Lord’s blessing on the land in 9:13 presents an image of an unbelievably verdant and fully cultivated land that is a fulfillment of the Mosaic covenant promises for obedient Israel (Lev 26:3–5) in the Day of the Lord (Joel 3[4 MT]:18).

The imagery of agricultural productivity in 9:13 switches in 9:14 to one of a peaceful, stable, secure, and prosperous life in the land. After the Lord returns his people from their captivity they will rebuild cities and plant their fields and gardens and enjoy the produce of the land, something he had not allowed them to do before (cf. 4:9; 5:11).

Verse 15 concludes the book with a promise that Israel will be established in the land in peace. The Lord will “plant” (καταφυτεύω) them like a garden in “their land,” which he “gave to them,” and they will never (emphatic negation) be “dragged out of the land” (ἐκσπάω). See 3:12 (2×) and 4:11 for other uses of this last verb as a powerful image of the Lord snatching Israel out of situations of seemingly utter destruction. The Lord will do for Israel as he has promised to their fathers; he will give them their land when he brings back the captivity of his people Israel (9:14–15).

The one making these promises is identified at the close of the book. The translator changes the Hebrew’s “the LORD your God” to “the Lord, the God, the Almighty One.” The title (ὁ παντοκράτωρ) indicates that this God is God over all people (see Glenny, 186–189, on this title in LXX-Amos). His translation of the concluding words of the book leaves his readers with a picture of the Lord as the God of all peoples on the earth, and not just the God of Israel, a theme that was also emphasized in 9:12.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackroyd, P.R. "Criteria for the Maccabean Dating of Old Testament Literature." *Vetus Testamentum* 3 (1953): 113–132.
- Aharoni, Yohanan. *The Land of the Bible: A Historical Geography*. Rev. and enl. ed. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1979.
- Allen, Leslie C. *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, and Micah*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.
- A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright. Oxford: University Press, 2007.
- Arieti, James A. "A Study in the Septuagint of Amos." Ph.D. Diss., Stanford University, 1972.
- Auld, A. Graeme. *Joshua: Jesus Son of Nauë in Codex Vaticanus*. Septuagint Commentary Series. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Barthélemy, Dominique. *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Tome 3. Ezéchiel; Daniel et les 12 Prophètes*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.
- Baillet, M., J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, *Les "Petites Grottes" de Qumran DJD 3/1*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.
- Bauer, Walter, Frederick W. Danker, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2000.
- Blass, Friedrich, and Albert Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated and revised by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1961.
- Bons, Eberhard, Jan Joosten, and Stephan Kessler. *Les Douze Prophètes: Osée*. La Bible D'Alexandrie 23.1. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2002.
- Brenton, Lancelot C.L. *The Septuagint Version, With Apocrypha, Greek, and English*. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, n.d. Repr., Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976.
- Bruce, F.F. "Prophetic Interpretation in the Septuagint." *BIOSCS* 12 (1979): 17–26.
- Caird, G.B. "Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint. II." Pages 133–152 in *Septuagintal Lexicography*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 1. Missoula, Montana: University of Montana, 1972.
- Cathcart, Kevin J, and Robert P. Gordon, *The Targum of the Minor Prophets*. The Aramaic Bible, vol. 14. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989.
- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- Conybeare, F.C. and St. George Stock. *Grammar of Septuagint Greek*. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1905; Repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001.
- Cripps, Richard S. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Amos*. London: SPCK, 1969.
- Croy, N. Clayton. *3 Maccabees*. Septuagint Commentary Series. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Dafni, Evangelia G. and Aaron Schar. "Amos." Pages 2:2339–2361 in *Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament*.

- Edited by M. Karrer and W. Kraus. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011.
- Daniel S. *Recherches sur le Vocabulaire du Culte dans la Septante. EeC LXI*. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1966.
- deSilva, David A. *Introducing the Apocrypha*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002.
- de Waard, Jan. "A Greek Translation-Technical Treatment of Amos 1:15." Pages 111–118 in *On Language, Culture and Religion: In Honour of Eugene A. Nida*. Edited by M. Black and W.A. Smalley. Approaches to Semiotics 56. The Hague-Paris: Mouton, 1974.
- . "Translation Techniques Used by the Greek Translators of Amos." *Bib* 59 (1978): 339–350.
- Dines, Jennifer Mary. "The Septuagint of Amos: A Study in Interpretation." Ph.D. Diss., London, 1991.
- . *The Septuagint*. UBW series. New York: T & T Clark, 2004.
- Dunn, James D.G. and John W. Rogerson, eds. *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Fanning, B.M. *Verbal Aspect in the Greek New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.
- Ferreiro, Alberto, ed. *The Twelve Prophets*. Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: Old Testament XIV. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003.
- Freedman, D.N., ed. *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- ed. *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Garrett, Duane A. *Amos: A Handbook on the Hebrew Text*. Waco: Baylor University, 2008.
- Gelston, Anthony. "Some Hebrew Misreadings in the Septuagint of Amos." *VT* 52:4 (2002): 493–500.
- Glenny, W. Edward. "Hebrew Misreadings or Free Translation in the Septuagint of Amos?" *VT* 57:4 (2007): 524–547.
- . *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos*. VTSup 126; Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- . "Summary of 'Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos'" *Tyndale Bulletin* 61.1 (2010): 53–56.
- . "The Septuagint and Apostolic Hermeneutics: Amos 9 in Act 15." *BBR* 22.1 (2012): 1–26.
- . "Ephraim Dwelt in Egypt: Egypt and Assyria in the Septuagint of Hosea." Pages 457–471 in *XIV Congress of the IOSCS, Helsinki, 2010*. Edited by Melvin K.H. Peters. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.
- . *Hosea: A Commentary Based on Hosea in Codex Vaticanus*. Septuagint Commentary Series. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Hanhart, Robert. "The Translation of the Septuagint in Light of Earlier Tradition and Subsequent Influences." Pages 339–379 in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars. SCS 33. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Harl, Marguerite, Gilles Dorival, and Olivier Munnich. *La Bible grecque des Septante: Du Judaïsme hellénistique au Christianisme ancien*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1988.
- Harper, William Rainey. *Amos and Hosea*. ICC. Repr., T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1979.
- Hatch, Edwin. *Essays in Biblical Greek*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1889.

- Hengel, Martin. *Property and Riches in the Early Church*. Minneapolis, Fortress, 1974.
- . *Judaism and Hellenism*. 2 vols. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.
- Horgan, Maurya P. *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*. CBQMS 8. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979.
- Howard, George. "Some Notes on the Septuagint of Amos." *VT* 12 (1970): 108–112.
- Jastrow, Marcus. *Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. Repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Johnson, Sherman Eldridge. "The Septuagint of Amos." Ph.D. Diss., University of Chicago, 1936.
- Karrer, M., and W. Kraus. *Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament*. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011.
- Kittel, G. and G. Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.
- Kelly, J.N.D. *Early Christian Doctrines*. Rev. ed. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978.
- Kraft, Robert A. ed. *Septuagintal Lexicography*. SBLSCS 1. Missoula, Montana: University of Montana, 1972.
- Liddell, H.G., R. Scott, and H.S. Jones. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: University Press, 1996.
- Lightfoot, John. *A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica: Matthew–1 Corinthians*. 4 vols. Repr., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979.
- Louw, Johannes P. and Eugene A. Nida, eds. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. 2d ed. 2 vols. New York: United Bible Society, 1989.
- Lust, Johan. "Messianism and Septuagint." Pages 174–191 in *Congress Volume Salamanca 1983*. Edited by J.A. Emerton. Supp VT 36. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Lust, J., E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992 and 1996.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Paleography*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Milik, J.T. "La Patrie de Tobie," *RB* 73 (1966): 522–530.
- Moulton, James Hope. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. 4 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1908–1976.
- Moyise, Steve. "The Minor Prophets in Paul." Pages 77–114 in *The Minor Prophets in the New Testament*. Edited by Maarten J.J. Menken and Steve Moyise. LNTS 377. London: T&T Clark, 2009.
- Muraoka, T. "Is the Septuagint Amos VIII 12–IX 10 a Separate Unit?" *VT* 20 (1970): 496–500.
- . "Septuagintal Lexicography: Some General Issues." Pages 17–48 in *Melbourne Symposium in Septuagint Lexicography*. Edited by Takamitsu Muraoka. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 28. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- . "Hebrew Hapax Legomena and Septuagint Lexicography." Pages 205–222 in *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Leuven 1989*. Edited by Claude E. Cox. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- . *A Greek English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets*. Louvain: Peters, 2002.

- . *A Greek English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Louvain: Peters, 2009.
- Palmer, James Karol. “‘Not Made With Tracing Paper’: Studies in the Septuagint of Zechariah.” Ph.D. Diss., Cambridge University, 2004.
- Park, Aaron W. *The Book of Amos as Composed and Read in Antiquity*. Studies in Biblical Literature 37. New York: Peter Lang, 2001.
- Paul, Shalom M. *A Commentary on the Book of Amos*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Pisano, Stephen. “‘Egypt’ in the Septuagint of Hosea.” Pages 301–308 in *Tradition of the Text*. Edited by Gerard J. Norton and Stephen Pisano. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis, 109. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.
- Porter, Stanley E. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.
- . *Verbal Aspect in the Greek New Testament with Reference to Tense and Mood*. Studies in Biblical Greek 1. New York: Lang, 1989.
- Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935.
- Richard, E. “The Creative Use of Amos by the author of Acts.” *NT* 24 (1982): 37–53.
- Satterthwaite, Philip E. “The Translators as Imperialists: And Other Aspects of the Septuagint Translation of the Book of the Twelve,” An expanded version of a paper given to the Cambridge University OT Seminar, October 1997.
- Sawyer, J.F.A. “‘Those Priests in Damascus’: A possible example of anti-sectarian polemic in the Septuagint Version of Amos 3,12.” *ASTI* 8 (1970–1971): 123–130.
- Schaper, Joachim. *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*. WUNT, 2.76. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1995.
- Seeligmann, Isaac L. *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah. A Discussion of Its Problems*. MEOL 9. Leiden: Brill, 1948.
- Seitz, Christopher R. *Prophecy and Hermeneutics: Toward a New Introduction to the Prophets*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.
- Skeat, T.C. “The Codex Vaticanus in the Fifteenth Century.” *JTS* 35 (1984): 454–465.
- . “The Codex Sinaiticus, The Codex Vaticanus, and Constantine.” *JTS* (1999): 583–625.
- Smith, Gary V. *Amos*. Rev. ed. Mentor: Ross-Shire, Great Britain, 1998.
- Smyth, Werbert Weir. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1920.
- Spicq, Ceslas. *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament*. 3 vols. Translated and edited by James D. Ernest. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Stuart, Douglas. *Hosea-Jonah*. Word Biblical Commentary 31. Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1987.
- Swete, Henry Barclay. *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. University Press, Cambridge, 1914; repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1989.
- . *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*. 3 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1887.
- Thackeray, Henry St John. *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint*. Vol. 1, *Introduction, Orthography and Accidence*. Cambridge: University Press, 1909.
- . *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*. London: British Academy, 1921.
- Theocharous, Myrto. “Lexical Dependence and Intertextual Allusion in the Septuagint of the Twelve Prophets.” Ph.D. Diss., Cambridge University, 2011.

- The Septuagint Version, With Apocrypha, Greek, and English.* London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, n.d. Repr., Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976.
- Tov, Emanuel. *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch—A Discussion of an Early Revision of Jeremiah 29–52 and Baruch 1:1–3:8.* HSM 8. Scholars Press: Missoula, MT, 1976.
- . *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research.* Rev. and enl. ed. Jerusalem: SIMOR LTD, 1997.
- . “Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings.” Pages 109–128 in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint.* Edited by Emanuel Tov. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . “Three Dimensions of Words in the Septuagint.” Pages 87–94 in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint.* Edited by Emanuel Tov. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . *The Parallel Aligned Texts of the Greek and Hebrew Bible in Accordance Bible Software.*
- Turner, Nigel. *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1965.
- Turner, P.D.M. “Anoikodomeivn and Intra-Septuagintal Borrowing.” *VT* (1977): 472–473.
- van der Kooij, Arie. “The Old Greek of Isaiah 19:16–25: Translation and Interpretation.” Pages 127–166 in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Jerusalem 1986.* Edited by Claude E. Cox. SCS 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- . *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision.* VTSup 71. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- . “The Septuagint of Zechariah as Witness to an Early Interpretation of the Book.” Pages 53–64 in *The Book of Zechariah and Its Influence.* Edited by Christopher Tuckett. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003.
- VanGemenen, Willem A., gen. ed. *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis.* 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Walters, Peter. *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruption and Their Emendations.* Edited by D.W. Gooding. Cambridge: University Press, 1973.
- Wevers, John William. *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers.* SBLSCS 46. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- . *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus.* SBLSCS 44. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- . *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus.* SBLSCS 30. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- Wolff, Hans Walter. *Joel and Amos.* Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.
- Woodhouse, S.C. *English-Greek Dictionary: A Vocabulary of the Attic Language.* London: Routledge, 1985.
- Wright, T.J. “Amos and the Sycamore Fig.” *VT* 26 (1976): 362–368.
- Ziegler, Joseph. *Duodecim prophetae. Septuaginta* vol. XIII. 2d ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.

INDEX OF REFERENCES TO ANCIENT LITERATURE

SEPTUAGINT

Where versification in the LXX differs from the MT the MT versification is not listed in this index; it is sometimes given in the commentary. Occasionally passages in this section of the index are designated MT when the reason for the reference to the passage in the commentary is because of material in the Hebrew tradition that is not in the LXX.

Genesis		25:17	148
3:22	158	25:40	108
6:3	158	32:12	123
6:4	59, 158	32:22	51
8:21	104	34:10	67
10:14	154	37:3	60
11:31-32	47	Leviticus	
12:3	160	2:2	104
12:4-5	47	17:7	54
18:3	127	18:5	90
19:9	116	18:17	59
19:24-29	83	19:8	73
21:14	90	19:20-22	106
21:31-33	90	19:35-36	138
21:31	146	20	95
22:16	73, 139	20:23	95
24:43	148	22:18	78
25:19	50	24:10-23	117
26:31	90	25:9	145
26:33	146	25:21	44
27:40-41	50	26:3-4	161
27:43	47	26:5	160, 161
28:10	47	26:16	81
29:26	83	26:19	81
38:9	50	26:31	104
38:16	58	Numbers	
41:50	46	1:16	47
44:21	150	3:10	128
45:7	100	4:26	60
49:4	112	5:8	145
Exodus		12:4	44
1:11	46	14:14	148
1:13	137	15:7	104
12:23	127	20:14-21	50
14:13	158	23:6	148
20:21	103	23:17	148
21:17	137	24:5	121
23:5	127	24:17	108, 121
23:7-8	96	26:9	47

Numbers (*cont.*)

28:18	47
28:26	47
29:1	47
29:7	47
29:12	47
31:12	48
34:7	134
34:8	134
34:10	134
35:14	44

Deuteronomy

2:4	50
2:23	154
3:1	121
3:13	121
4:11	103
4:19	108
4:47	121
6:4	105
8:3	143
10:17	96
12:11	96
12:17	79
16:19	58, 96
17:2-5	108
17:16	114
18:18	143
21:8	123
23:7-8	50
24:2	135
24:7	137
25:4	156
25:14-15	138
27:2	53
27:4	53
27:19	58
28:7	113
28:10	160
28:22-24	81
28:30	97
28:39	97
29:22	83
30:4	109
30:20	100
32:7	158

Joshua

3:5	67
4:19-5:15	77
8:5	113
20:9	47
23:7	117

Judges

3:12-14	51
4:12	73
8:2	160
9:2	50
10:7-9	51
10:17	51
11:4-33	51
14:3	62
14:18	73

Ruth

2-3	156
3:2	155
3:11	70
3:13	145
4:7	98

1 Kingdoms

3:19	157
11:1-11	51
11:11	120
12:3	55
12:25-33	77
13:6	154
14:19	105
14:45	157
14:47	51
17:33	74
20:24	138
26:19	104
26:20	157
28:23	116

2 Kingdoms

1:19	86
1:25	86
2:26	51
3:27	58
5:11	49
5:20	149
6:2	160
6:8	149
7:23	105
8:12	51, 160
10:1-11	51
12:28	160
14:11	157
15:13	149
16:22	60
17:12	157
22:10	103
22:13	103
22:47	145
23:3	86
23:4	103

3 Kingdoms

1:52	157
5:1-12	49
5:26	49
6:3	62
7:13	44
7:25	44
8:37	76, 81
8:53	103
8:65	110
9:10-12	49
11:2-3	58
11:14	46
11:17	46
11:18-20	46
12:26-33	130, 131
15:20	46
16:31	49
16:32-33	145
17:10	135
18:4	150
18:17-36	150
20:2	98
21:1	46
21:17	46

4 Kingdoms

2:17	116
3:26	149
5:16	116
7	159
8:12	51
12:17-18	48
15:16	51
17:15-16	54
17:15	54
17:16-17	108
19:12	47
19:22	92
23:5	108
23:7	60
23:10	107, 108
23:24	108
25:9-10	54

1 Chronicles

5:4	121
13:5	110
14:2	92
20:3	46
23:17	92
28:20	145
29:3	92

2 Chronicles

1:1	92
4:4	44
6:1	103
7:14	160
20:1-30	51
20:19	92
20:25	97
24:26	51
28:5	48
32:27	97
35:24-25	142
36:10	97

1 Esdras

6:28	81
9:6	79
9:8	78
9:37-55	79

2 Esdras

4	109
7:17	127
8:27	97
10:9	44
12:10	52
12:19	52
14	109
14:9-15	52
16:17-19	52
18-19	79
18:8	79
19:3	79
19:31	141
21:27	90

Esther

1:6	112
14:16	139

Tobit

2:6	141
7:11	59
12:2	67

1 Maccabees

1:14-15	63
1:21	140
1:23	97
1:24	140
1:43	111
1:59	128
2:7	156
2:47	140
2:49-50	140
3:16-17	123
3:41	154

1 Maccabees (*cont.*)

3:43	73
3:49	61
4:29	49, 50
4:46	143
4:61	49, 50
5:1-3	50
5:15	48, 49
5:30	120
5:65	49, 50
6:66-68	154
9:41	142
9:50	110
10:61	76
10:77-87	154
11:61-62	154
13-14	115
13:27	97
14:36	115
15:3	76
15:21	76

2 Maccabees

1:16	135
1:22	91
2:7	123
2:19	128
2:21	105
2:22	123
3:3	145
3:24	105
4:7-17	52
4:9-15	63
4:18-19	49
4:32	49
5:4	105
5:15	52
7:1	152
7:3	3, 75
7:9	147
7:11	147
7:14	147
10:30	149
10:36	149
11:9	125
12:22	105
12:44-45	147
13:8	128
14:15	105
15:27	105

3 Maccabees

2:30	128
3:30	108
6:4	103

4 Maccabees

2:8	127
6:19	108
6:28	123
8:13	75
11:18	75
12:1	75
12:17	123
15:32	76
16:13	125
17:22	148
18:8	50
18:20	75

Psalms

7:8	92
7:15	154
17:8	140
17:10	103
17:47	145
18:13-15	85
20:13	100
28:7	149
32:17	114
45:3-4	140
54:20	98
64:8	106
67:2	113
67:19	92
73:6	139
73:13-14	150, 151
74:6	92
76:17	140
77:18	85
88:5	98
96:2	103
103:25-26	151
118:6	150
129:4	145
139:11	157
140:4	58
134:15-18	128
148:7	151

Prayer of Manasses

6	153
---	-----

Proverbs

5:12	58
11:1	138
12:13	95
14:28	114
17:16	114
17:23	58
20:10	138
20:23	138

22:14	154	50:14	128
21:15	95	50:26	109
22:16	56	50:23	158
22:22	95	51:5	161
29:21	111	Hosea	
30:15	44	2:5	142
31:23	95	2:11	104
31:31	95	3:4	143
Ecclesiastes		4:15	77, 90, 145
6:6	62	5:8	65
Song of Songs		5:10	51
1:17	135	5:11	54
1:11	115	6:3	63
8:6	72	6:6	78
Job		7:6	103
1:16	157	8:2	130
7:12	150, 151	8:6	66
11:15	91	9:5	104
13:3	95	9:10	95
14:14	147	9:15	77
15:22	127	10:8	128
19:25	147	11:8	142
26:12-13	150	11:10	43
26:13	151	12:7	138
28:4	53	12:12	77
28:15	98	13:1-4	85
32:12	95	13:15	97
38:9	86	13:16	51
38:38	53	14:4	114
Wisdom of Solomon		Amos	
3	147	1-2	94, 96, 97
3:7	91	1:1	41, 48, 72, 140
5:4	128	1:2	4, 41, 42, 47, 65, 67
9:5	113	1:3-5	4, 41, 43, 46
12:4	128	1:3	41, 43, 51, 69, 89, 96, 97
13:10-13	128	1:4	45, 51, 129
14:15	128	1:5	45, 47, 54, 65, 155
14:23	128	1:6-8	48, 111
Sirach		1:6-7	47
5:9	155	1:6	43, 45, 48, 49, 55, 82, 96
6:15	98	1:7	45, 51, 57, 126
8:2	58	1:8	45, 48, 49, 100
11:4	67	1:9-10	69
21:10	154	1:9	43, 45, 48, 82, 96
23:2	148	1:10	45, 51, 126
26:14	98	1:11-12	53
27:26	154	1:11	43, 45, 96, 125, 140, 151
32:17	58	1:12	45, 51, 126
34:20-21	56	1:13-15	53
48:17	121	1:13	43, 46, 96
49:12	159	1:14	45, 51, 53, 126, 141, 152
50:12	128	1:15	4, 45, 52, 61, 142

Amos (*cont.*)

2:1	43, 45, 96
2:2	45, 51
2:3	53
2:4-5	41
2:4	4, 42, 43, 45, 54, 65, 96, 108, 115
2:5	42, 45, 51
2:6-16	41, 61
2:6-8	44, 55, 62, 119, 136
2:6-7	55, 56, 98
2:6	43, 44, 55, 58, 96, 137, 138
2:7	55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 90, 96, 137, 139
2:8	4, 60, 61, 148
2:9-12	62
2:9-11	61, 62
2:9-10	61
2:10	141
2:11	61, 143
2:12	59, 61, 62, 137, 143
2:13-16	61, 62, 63
2:13	96, 106
2:14-16	44, 63
2:14-15	62
2:14	62
2:15	62
2:16	45, 63, 144
3:1-8	66, 67
3:1-2	63
3:1	64, 72, 88, 118, 136
3:2	62, 64, 71, 83, 96
3:3-8	63, 118
3:3-6	64, 65, 66
3:3	65
3:4	43, 65, 67
3:5	65, 125, 134, 153
3:6	64, 65
3:7-8	64, 66, 67
3:7	66
3:8	65, 66, 67
3:9-10	119
3:9	67, 68, 145
3:10	67, 68, 69
3:11-12	83, 94
3:11	67, 68, 69, 89, 96
3:12-13	72
3:12	4, 6, 68, 69, 70, 71, 145, 155, 162
3:13-15	83
3:13	52, 70, 71, 84, 88, 118, 133, 136

3:14-15	128
3:14	64, 71, 72, 77, 90, 97, 148, 153, 157
3:15	70, 71, 72, 94
4:1-13	85
4:1-3	72, 76, 78, 80, 94
4:1	55, 56, 73, 74, 88, 97, 119, 136, 137, 139, 145
4:2-3	73, 83, 130
4:2	3, 4, 70, 74, 76, 77, 115, 139, 142, 143, 144
4:3	4, 69, 70, 77
4:4-5	85
4:4	4, 71, 77, 78, 79, 80, 90, 145
4:5	4, 70, 78, 79, 80
4:6-12	44
4:6-11	83, 87, 157
4:6	70, 71, 80, 81, 90
4:7-13	6
4:7-11	95
4:7-10	71
4:7	70, 80, 81, 160
4:8	71, 80, 81
4:9-11	82, 83
4:9	6, 71, 76, 80, 81, 121, 162
4:10	6, 71, 76, 80, 114, 151
4:11	6, 71, 76, 80, 162
4:12	78, 83, 84, 86, 87, 96
4:13	3, 4, 71, 74, 84, 86, 87, 92, 93, 94, 100, 101, 109, 147, 153, 159
5:1-15	89, 99
5:1-11	94
5:1-3	87, 88, 89, 101
5:1	72, 87, 88, 101, 118, 136
5:2	90, 92, 125, 144, 146, 147, 152, 153
5:3	69, 90, 116, 118, 144
5:4-6	87, 89, 91, 99, 101
5:4-5	143, 152
5:4	69, 87, 90, 94, 159, 160
5:5	77, 78, 80, 90, 91, 100, 130, 145, 146, 148
5:6	76, 89, 90, 91, 92, 94, 100, 114, 118, 159, 160
5:7-9	84, 92, 94, 147, 152
5:7	93, 106, 153
5:8	71, 78, 86, 93, 94, 109, 125, 141, 153
5:9	94
5:10-15	119
5:10-13	87, 94

5:10-11	98	6:10	96, 117
5:10	94, 95, 96, 100, 115	6:11	74, 116, 118, 119
5:11-12	56, 96, 97	6:12-14	118
5:11	55, 95, 96, 137, 139, 162	6:12	63, 106, 114, 115, 117, 119
5:12	55, 58, 95, 98, 99, 137	6:13	119, 137
5:13	96, 98, 99, 102	6:14	74, 110, 115, 118, 119, 120
5:14-15	87, 89, 99, 101, 152, 153, 155	7:1-11	6
5:14	71, 90, 100, 101, 102, 137	7:1-6	127, 157
5:15	71, 87, 91, 95, 98, 100, 101, 106, 114	7:1-3	120, 123, 124
5:16-7:9	101	7:1	4, 121, 122, 134, 155
5:16-17	87, 101, 136, 142	7:2	116, 120, 122, 123, 124, 133, 146, 147
5:16	69, 71, 88, 96, 101, 102, 109, 114	7:3	123, 124
5:17	102	7:4-7	6, 124
5:18-20	87, 104, 109	7:4-6	6, 120
5:18	93, 102, 103, 141, 152	7:4	76
5:19-20	103	7:5	124, 133, 137, 146, 147
5:20	93, 141, 152	7:7-9	6, 120, 124, 129, 134
5:21-6:14	6, 107, 120	7:7	125, 126, 127
5:21-27	104, 109	7:8-9	6
5:21-24	119	7:8	6, 125, 126, 127, 135, 144, 146
5:21-23	120	7:9-17	143, 148
5:21	105, 106	7:9	3, 4, 118, 126, 128, 130, 136, 142, 147, 148, 151
5:22	105, 106	7:10-9:10	129
5:23	105, 106	7:10-17	90, 125, 129, 134, 136
5:24	106, 120	7:10	77, 118, 129, 131, 133, 137
5:25-27	2, 54, 107, 108, 109	7:11	129, 130, 131, 134, 136, 151
5:25	61, 118	7:12	41, 42, 129, 130, 131, 133
5:26-27	52, 130	7:13	77, 130, 131, 136
5:26	54, 70, 158	7:14-15	42, 130, 131, 133
5:27	71, 100, 101	7:14	132, 133, 137
6:1-14	104, 109	7:15	55, 67, 131, 132, 133
6:1-7	114, 115	7:16-17	130, 133
6:1	4, 42, 87, 102, 111, 115, 118, 145, 146	7:16	88, 118, 136
6:2	48, 110, 119	7:17	69, 96, 134, 151
6:3-5	113	8:1-3	120, 125
6:3	111, 115, 152	8:1	134, 135
6:1-7	120	8:2	126, 134, 135, 136, 144, 146, 147
6:4-7	110	8:3	127, 135, 136, 141, 142, 143, 144, 158
6:4-6	111	8:4-14	125, 134, 136
6:4	111, 125	8:4-10	143
6:5	111, 112, 113	8:4-6	56, 136, 139, 140
6:6	91, 100, 111, 113, 115	8:4	55, 56, 78, 88, 136, 137, 139, 144
6:7	4, 96, 109, 114, 115, 119, 130	8:5	137, 138
6:8-14	115	8:6	55, 57, 137, 138
6:8-11	118	8:7-14	136
6:8	67, 73, 95, 115, 133, 139, 144	8:7	4, 50, 51, 73, 133, 139, 140, 142, 143, 144
6:9-10	115, 116, 118		
6:9	89, 117, 123		

Amos (<i>cont.</i>)		5:10	114
8:8-10	140, 142	6:6-8	78, 106
8:8	4, 141, 143, 144, 152	6:9	70
8:9	93, 125, 141, 143, 144, 153, 158	6:11	138
8:10	88, 101, 137, 141, 142, 143	6:15	97
8:11-14	143	7:14	158
8:11-12	74, 144	Joel	
8:11	76, 140, 152, 153, 158	1	82
8:12	137, 143, 144	1:3	42
8:13	141, 144, 158	1:4	122
8:14	4, 62, 89, 90, 118, 139, 144, 145, 146, 148	1:6	122
8:16	137	1:11	160
9:1-6	152	1:15	102
9:1-4	44, 120, 147	1:16	69
9:1	100, 125, 142, 149, 150, 151, 152, 157	2:1	102
9:2-4	150, 151	2:2	103
9:3	151	2:10	103, 141
9:4	130, 152, 155, 157	2:18	122
9:5-6	84, 92, 147, 150, 152	2:20	122
9:5	4, 71, 94, 111, 140, 141, 144, 149, 152, 153	2:25	122
9:6	71, 86, 94, 109, 125, 153	2:31	102
9:7	4, 64, 147, 153, 154, 155, 157	3:1	98, 122
9:8	80, 84, 94, 118, 133, 153, 155, 156, 157	3:4-8	48
9:9-10	4, 157	3:4-7	49
9:9	118, 153, 155, 157	3:5	136
9:10	62, 137, 151, 156	3:14	102, 105
9:11-15	2, 42, 157, 158	3:15	103, 141
9:11-12	3, 4, 158, 159	3:17	42
9:11	4, 42, 71, 72, 108, 144, 146, 147	3:18	161
9:12	3, 4, 86, 101, 160, 161	4:16(MT)	43
9:13-15	74, 160	Obadiah	
9:13	76, 97, 161, 162	2	124
9:14	82, 160, 161, 162	9	51
9:15	62, 71, 86, 125, 153, 161, 162	10	50
Micah		12	50
1:1	42	14	148
1:3	86	15	102
1:4	144	18	91
1:8	101	Jonah	
1:10	128	1:13	116
2:8	69	4:7	121
3:3	75	4:8	148
3:4	98	4:10	42
3:9	95	Nahum	
3:11	96	1:5	144
5:2	124	1:8	63, 141
		1:9	141
		1:14	42
		2:8	43, 113
		2:10	97
		3:12	144
		3:19	114

Habakkuk		1:9	83
1:7	52	1:13	138
2:2	63	1:23	96
2:4	90	2:7	114
2:11	43	3:3	67
3:3	51	3:8	66
3:4	103	4:1	160
3:6	144	4:3	73, 89
3:8	51	5:23	96
3:11	103	6:10	92, 99
3:14	149	7:11	92
Zephaniah		11:3-4	95
1:9	149	13:6	102, 136
1:14	102	13:9	102
1:15	103	13:19	83
1:16	53	13:20	158
1:18	141	13:21	106
2:5	154	14:14	124
2:9	145	15:2	128
2:14	135	16:5	158
3:4	73	17:13	156
3:12	89	18:5	97
3:16	98	19:16-25	153, 160
3:19	98	22:4	156
3:20	98	22:12	142
Haggai		24:19	140
1:9	63	25:1	67
2:14	95	25:2	158
Zechariah		26:13	117
2:5	125	26:14	147
3:2	83	26:19	147
6:6	51	27:1	150, 151
7:10	137	27:9	53
9:10	114	28:2-3	114
9:14	51	28:15-19	127
10:6	91, 114	28:27-28	156
12:2	144	29:21	95
12:10	142	30:24	156
12:11	77	33:22	127
13:3	116, 123	37:12	47
13:8	89	37:23	92
14	160	40:26	92
14:4	69	44	128
14:5	73	48:12	158
14:11	157	50:2	62
Malachi		50:4-5	66
3:4	158	54:2	60
3:5	57, 96, 137	55:3	95
3:10	138	58:6	57
4:5	143	59:1	62
Isaiah		60:2	103
1:1	41	60:22	124

Isaiah (<i>cont.</i>)		37:6	81
61:12-22	157	38:10	156
63:9	158	39:34	160
65:5-7	110	39:35	107
Jeremiah		50:13	46
1:1-4	41, 42	51:24-30	117
1:1	41	51:25	78, 79
1:18-19	125	Lamentations	
2:5	54	1-4	87
2:18	82	1:1	88
3:5	51	2:9	143
4:24	140	2:11	156
4:27	141	2:13	114
5:1	123	3:14	128
5:7	123	3:47	114
5:8	115	3:48	156
5:10	141	4:10	156
5:18	141	Ezekiel	
5:27	135, 149	1:1	41
6:26	142	1:4	103
7:6	137	1:13	103
13:27	115	1:27	103
14:9	160	1:28	103
15:2	128	4:3	125
15:13	98	4:9	135
15:15-16	160	7:2	135
15:16	160	7:3	135
15:20	125	7:5	135
19:11	135	7:10	102
20:7	128	7:18	142
20:9	117	7:26	143
22:3	137	10:4	103
22:15-16	142	11	77
24:6	152	11:3	75
26:7-8	140	11:13	141
26:15	113	13:5	102
26:21	113	13:13	141
26:28	141	16	60
27:20	123	16:16	60, 61
27:33	137	16:25	50
27:40	83	18:2	80
28:13	135	20 (MT)	108
28:34	151	21:13	70
28:42	106	21:15	107
29:4	154	20:17	141
30:19	52	20:24	150
30:32	156	21:20	107
31:19	113	21:33	107
31:26	128	22:7	137
31:39	128	22:29	137
32:30	42	23:20	115
32:33	102	23:37	76

23:44	59	39:6	121
24	77	39:11	121
24:1-14	74	39:15	121
25:16	154	39:25	48
26:4	156	41:20	135
26:17	88	43:2	103
26:20	154	43:14	149
27:23	47	43:17	149
27:31	142	43:20	149
28-32	76, 77	44:27	145
28:7	76	45:1	134
29:3	151	46:11	104
29:12	156	46:12	79
30:11	76	47:5	107
30:17	46	Daniel	
31:4	124	3:7	105
31:12	76	3:10	105
31:14	124, 154	3:15	105
32:2	151	3:25	74, 75
32:12	76	3:46	74, 75
32:18	154	5:24 (Th)	127
32:21	154	5:25 (Th)	127
32:24	154	6:11 (Th)	127
32:29	154	8:20-26	68
32:30	154	8:24 (Th)	68
34:12	103	9:9 (Th)	145
36:19	156	9:18-19	160
36:29	76	9:27	141
36:35-36	158	9:27 (Th)	141
38-39	121, 122, 124	10:21 (Th)	127
38:5	121, 122	11:10	127
38:6	122	11:14	159
38:7	122	11:26	127
38:8	122	12:2	147
38:20	157	12:6	67, 68
39:2-8	122	Bel and the Dragon	
39:2	122	23	151
38:9	122	25	151
38:15	122	27	151
38:17	121	28	151

DEAD SEA SCROLLS

CD VI-VII	52	1QM XI 1-XII 15	
CD VI 15	155		121
CD VII	70, 159	1QH III 12-18	155
CD VII 13-19	108	4Q174 1-3 I 12	159
CD VII 14-15	107	5QAm(4)1	46
CD VII 16-20	107		

NEW TESTAMENT

Matthew		Romans	
9:33	83	3:4	92, 99
Luke		Hebrews	
4:20	150	12:22	104
6:20	56	Revelation	
2:48	83	9:3	155
Acts		16:20	113
7	109	20:1–3	155
7:41–42	108		
7:42–43	107		
15:16–17	4, 159, 160		

OTHER JEWISH, CHRISTIAN, AND HELLENISTIC LITERATURE

<i>Aristeas</i>		7.203	47
12–27	56	9.82	60
128–172	55	Hesiod, <i>Theogony</i>	
Aristotle, <i>Meteorologica</i>		557	104
346b	85	Homer, <i>Odyssey</i>	
369a–b	85	8, 363	104
371a	85	9, 270ff	95
Athenaeus, <i>Daipnosophistae</i>		10, 517	154
2.51b	132	16, 423	95
Chrysostom, <i>Against the Anomoeans</i>		Homer, <i>Iliad</i>	
4.18–19	149	8, 48	104
Cyril		23, 148	104
441B–D	58	Jerome	
425D–428B	49	1.122	58
488C	85	Josephus, <i>Antiquitates judaicae</i>	
Diodorus Siculus		3.181	60
xx, 1	107	11.148–158	79
Dionysius of Halicarnassus		12.133	110
6.53	47	12.239ff	52
2.76	47	12.257–264	110, 111
1 Enoch		13.356–364	154
7:1	59	15.2.5	47
14:9	125	Josephus, <i>Bellum judaicum</i>	
86:4	115	5.212	60
Galen		Josephus, <i>Contra Apionem</i>	
14, 305	133	2.1	133
Herodotus, <i>Histories</i>		<i>Jubilees</i>	
1.93	59	24:27–33	154
1.113	135	Philo, <i>Allegorical Interpretation</i>	
2.63, 101, 121	149	1.62	60
2.228	124	Plato, <i>Euthyphro</i>	
3.80	114	4de	95
4.147	114	14b	95
5.75	47		
5.77	149		

Pliny, *Natural History*

13, 14, 56 132

37, 55–60 125

Plutarch, *Moralia*

2.707a 47

Plutarch, *Pericles*

24 59

Sibylline Oracles

3:313 121

3:512 121

Strabo

17.1.28 72

Talmud

Yoma 86b 44

Shab 62b 112

Testament of Judah

9:4 125

Theophrastus, *History of Plants*

4, 2, 1 132

Theodore

257B 58

269C–D 85

Theodoret

1685C 85

Thucydides

4.61 47

4.97.3 60

Vettius Valens

78, 18 133

INDEX OF AUTHORS

- Ackroyd, P.R., 146
 Aharoni, Y., 146
 Arieti, J.A., 1, 65, 66, 88, 106, 110, 111, 148
 Auld, A.G., 6
- Bons, E., 4
 Brenton, L.C.L., 10, 64, 66, 70, 81, 82, 88, 93,
 111, 112, 117, 127, 135, 137, 140, 145, 148, 149,
 151
 Bruce, F.F., 120, 121, 122
- Caird, G.B., 50
 Charlesworth, J.H., 121
 Cripps, R.S., 55, 110, 132, 154
 Croy, N.C., 128
- Dafni, E.G., 4
 deSilva, D.A., 141
 De Waard, J., 73, 157
 Dines, J.M., 2, 4, 10, 42, 44, 47, 48, 51, 54, 57,
 58, 59, 60, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71,
 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 80, 81, 82, 84, 85,
 86, 88, 92, 93, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112,
 114, 116, 117, 118, 120, 121, 125, 127, 128, 130,
 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 140, 141, 142, 145,
 146, 148, 149, 151, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159,
 160
- Fanning, B.M., 93, 131
- Garrett, D.A., 53, 123
 Gelston, A., 120
 Glenny, W.E., 3, 10, 41, 51, 52, 68, 70, 71, 86,
 96, 107, 109, 110, 114, 120, 130, 135, 136, 137,
 139, 140, 141, 145, 148, 150, 152, 153, 154, 157,
 158, 159, 160, 162
- Harl, M., Dorivall, G., and Munnich, O., 70,
 141
 Harper, W.R., 42
 Hatch, E., 106
 Hengel, M., 56–57
- Jastrow, M., 111
 Johnson, S.E., 1, 74, 88, 111
 Joosten, J., 5
- Kelly, J.N.D., 85
 Kraft, R.A., 50, 51, 140
- Lightfoot, J., 107
 Louw, J.P., and Nida, E.A., 113
 Lust, J., 121
- Metzger, B.M., 5, 129
 Milik, J.T., 142
 Muraoka, T., 78, 146
- Palmer, J.K., 77
 Park, A.W., 2, 3, 42, 64, 65, 66, 67, 108, 110,
 119, 120, 125, 133, 149, 161
 Paul, S.M., 43, 46, 50, 55, 59, 61, 94, 105, 130,
 144, 148, 149, 152
 Porter, S.E., 90, 100
- Rahlf's, A., 3, 5, 8, 63, 81, 88
 Richard, E., 158, 159
- Satterthwaite,, 76, 80, 109, 140, 157
 Sawyer, J.F.A., 52, 69, 70
 Schaper, J., 146
 Schart, A., 4
 Seeligmann, I.L., 49, 66, 114
 Skeat, T.C., 5, 6, 7
 Smith, G.V., 44, 46, 88, 134
 Smyth, W.W., 55, 62, 64, 68, 91, 99, 104, 105,
 106, 115, 124, 129, 138, 143, 144, 151
 Spicq, C., 60, 104, 105, 108, 139, 156
 Stuart, D., 50, 51, 54, 105, 143, 148, 154
 Swete, H.B., 3, 8, 9, 81, 88
- Theocharous, M., 54, 79, 106, 107, 113
 Tov, E., 48, 65, 71, 76, 78, 79
 Turner, P.D.M., 159
- van der Kooij, A., 49, 82, 114, 153, 158
- Wallace, D.B., 90, 99, 100, 106, 115, 131, 133, 137,
 138
 Walters, P., 160
 Wevers J.W., 105, 121, 137, 139, 161
 Wolff, H.W., 51, 59, 81, 93, 103, 105, 108, 135,
 149, 150, 154

Woodhouse, S.C., 113
 Wright, T.J., 132

Ziegler, J., 3, 5, 8, 63, 81, 88

